

THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY



VOLUME XX · JANUARY 1950 · NUMBER 1
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY

A Journal of Investigation and Discussion in the Field of Library Science

Established by The Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago with the Co-operation of The American Library Association, The Bibliographical Society of America, and The American Library Institute.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor

LEON CARNOVSKY

Editorial Assistant

SIBYLLE O. CRANE

Associate Editors

LESTER E. ASHEIM

BERNARD R. BERELSON

PIERCE BUTLER

HERMAN H. FUSSLER

FRANCES E. HENNE

JESSE H. SHERA

DOUGLAS WAPLES

Advisory Editors

RALPH A. BEALS, Director, New York Public Library

WM. W. BISHOP, Librarian Emeritus, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

LESLIE E. BLISS, Librarian, Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, San Marino

EDWARD J. CARTER, Head, Libraries Section, UNESCO

CLARENCE H. FAUST, Dean of Humanities and Science, Stanford University

F. C. FRANCIS, Keeper of Printed Books, British Museum, London

ERNESTO G. GIETZ, Librarian, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales, Colegio Nacional de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires

CARLETON B. JOECKEL, School of Librarianship, University of California, Berkeley

CARL H. MILAM, Director of United Nations Libraries, Lake Success, N.Y.

RALPH MUNN, Director, Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh

WILHELM MUNTHE, Director, University Library, Oslo

CHARLES R. SANDERSON, Chief Librarian, Toronto

HENRY B. VAN HOESSEN, Librarian, Brown University, Providence

EDWIN ELLIOTT WILLOUGHBY, Chief Bibliographer, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.

LOUIS R. WILSON, Dean Emeritus, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago

The *Library Quarterly* was established by the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, with the assistance of the Carnegie Corporation, to fill the need suggested by a committee of the American Library Association for a journal of investigation and discussion in the field of librarianship. It is published in January, April, July, and October by the University of Chicago at the University Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$5.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.50. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Republic of Honduras, Mexico, Morocco (Spanish Zone), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rio de Oro, El Salvador, Spain (including Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, and the Spanish Offices in Northern Africa; Andorra), Spanish Guinea, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: for Canada and Newfoundland, 20 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$5.20), on single copies 5 cents (total \$1.55); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 48 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$5.48), on single copies 12 cents (total \$1.62). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following is an authorized agent for the British Empire, except North America and Australasia: The Cambridge University Press, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Communications for the editors, manuscripts, and books for review should be addressed to the Managing Editor, THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter January 2, 1911, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized January 9, 1931.

[PRINTED
IN U.S.A.]

THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. XX

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1950

No. 1

THE CATALOGING OF PUBLICATIONS OF CORPORATE AUTHORS	MORTIMER TAUBE	1
THE OBLIGATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE LIBRARIAN CONCERN- ING CENSORSHIP	LEON CARNOVSKY	21
AUSTRIAN LIBRARIES, PAST AND PRESENT	JOSEF STUMMVOLL	33
PUBLIC LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT IN BELGIUM	LEO SCHEVENHEL	39
THE COVER DESIGN	EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY	43
THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE		44
REVIEWS:		
<i>The Royal Society Scientific Information Conference, 21 June-2 July 1948: Report and Papers Submitted</i>	NORMAN T. BALL	45
Bernard Berelson, <i>The Library's Public: A Report of the Public Library Inquiry</i>	CHARLES R. SANDERSON	47
Gloria Waldron, <i>The Information Film: A Report of the Public Library Inquiry</i>	GERALD D. McDONALD	49
<i>The First Quarter Century of the Pierpont Morgan Library: A Retrospective Exhibition in Honor of Belle da Costa Greene, April 5 through July 23, 1949</i>	EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY	50
Library of Congress, <i>Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1948</i>	DONALD CONEY	51
<i>Fourteenth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States for the Year Ending June 30, 1948</i>		
<i>Ninth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States on the Franklin L. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, N.Y., for the Year Ending June 30, 1948</i>	ROBERT W. HILL	52
National Archives of India, <i>The Indian Archives</i> , Vol. I, No. 2 (April, 1947)	DOROTHY V. MARTIN	53
Vernon D. Tate and Margaret P. Hazen, <i>M.I.T. Library Annual, 1948</i>	BENJAMIN E. POWELL	54
Edwin R. Embree and Julia Waxman, <i>Investment in People: The Story of the Julius Rosen- wald Fund</i>	LOUIS R. WILSON	55
Joint Committee of the American Library Association and the Rural Sociological Society, "Report of the Proceedings of the Second Pre-conference Workshop for Librarians and Rural Sociologists . . . December 27, 1948"	ELEANOR H. MORGAN	56

[Contents continued on following page]

Margaret E. Egan, Joseph L. Wheeler, Wilma Bennett, and Jesse H. SHERA, "Survey of the Saginaw Library System: Final Report"	LOLETA D. FVAN	56
Joseph L. Wheeler, "A Regional Library Service for the East Bay Area"	JOHN BOYNTON KAISER	58
Carleton B. Joeckel, <i>Reaching Readers: Techniques of Extending Library Services: Papers Presented at the Library Institute . . . June 26-27, 1947</i>	HELEN M. HARRIS	59
Ernest J. Reece, <i>The Task and Training of Librarians</i>	HARRIET D. MACPHERSON	59
Harold Lancour, "Issues in Library Education: A Report of the Conference on Library Education, Princeton University, December 11th and 12th, 1948"	ROBERT L. GITLER	60
Bernard Berelson, <i>Education for Librarianship: Papers Presented at the Library Conference, University of Chicago, August 16-21, 1948</i>	ETHEL M. FAIR	62
Grace Carlton, <i>Spade-Work: The Story of Thomas Greenwood</i>	WILLIAM B. PATON	63
Marjorie Plant, <i>The Supply of Foreign Books and Periodicals to the Libraries of the United Kingdom: Report of a Survey Made under the Auspices of the Rockefeller Foundation</i>	VERNER W. CLAPP	63
J. H. P. Pafford, <i>American and Canadian Libraries: Some Notes on a Visit in the Summer of 1947</i>	G. R. LOMER	65
Georgette de Grolier, <i>Livre et document: Études sur le livre, les bibliothèques et la documentation</i>	JERROLD ORNE	66
Joris Vorstius, <i>Ergebnisse und Fortschritte der Bibliographie in Deutschland seit dem ersten Weltkrieg</i>	LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON	67
Joris Vorstius, <i>Die Sachkatalogisierung in den wissenschaftlichen Allgemeinbibliotheken Deutschlands</i>	LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON	68
A. D. Roberts, <i>Introduction to Reference Books</i>	LOUIS SHORES	69
Arthur M. Sampley and Louise Evans, "North Texas Regional Union List of Serials: Comprising the Libraries of North Texas State Teachers College, Southern Methodist University, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Texas Christian University, Texas State College for Women, and the Public Libraries of Dallas and Fort Worth"	ROBERT W. WADSWORTH	70
Lucy B. Foote, <i>Author Headings for the Official Publications of the State of Louisiana</i>	ROBERT R. DOUGLASS	71
Committee of the Social Science Group of the Special Libraries Association, <i>Public Administration Libraries: A Manual of Practice</i>		
<i>Source Materials in Public Administration: A Selected Bibliography Reprinted from PAS Publication No. 102</i>	ROSE L. VORMELKER	72
Clara Egli LeGear, "Maps, Their Care, Repair and Preservation in Libraries"	AGNES WHITMARSH	73
Louis V. Ledoux, <i>Japanese Prints: Bunchō to Utamarō: In the Collection of Louis V. Ledoux</i>	LUDWIG BACHHOFFER	74
U.S. Army Medical Library, <i>Index-Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon General's Office</i>	GERTRUDE MINSK	74
BOOKS RECEIVED		75

THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Volume XX

JANUARY 1950

Number 1

THE CATALOGING OF PUBLICATIONS OF CORPORATE AUTHORS

MORTIMER TAUBE

THE preparation of an earlier draft of this paper was undertaken by the author as part of his regular duties as chief of the Science and Technology Project of the Library of Congress. The librarian of Congress saw in the Science and Technology Project not only an instrument for increasing the Library's service to the National Defense Establishment but an opportunity to develop new forms of documentation, that is to say, new forms of collecting, cataloging, indexing, organizing, and disseminating information.

With special reference to the topic of this paper, the Project was encouraged by Dr. Frederick Wagman, director of the Processing Department, and Miss Lucille Morsch, chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division, to persist in the search for new techniques, in spite of the author's reluctance to venture into a field in which the defense of established practice is so passionate and so strong.

This is not to say that anyone other than the author is responsible for the arguments and conclusions in the paper. The draft submitted to the librarian represented the kind of self-criticism encouraged and fostered by the present administration of the Library; yet in its fi-

nal form the paper must be regarded not as expressing the official views of any part of the Library administration but as representing only the views of the author in his private capacity.

Only a great and viable institution would encourage in its employees, or even former employees, the kind of uninhibited criticism I have attempted; and Dr. Wagman has assured me that he intends to devise and institute experiments in order to determine whether or not the conclusions of the paper are indeed applicable, beyond the requirements of the special library, to the cataloging operations of the Library of Congress as a whole.

In the last analysis, what the Library of Congress does must be definitive for other libraries, since the distribution of printed cards constitutes an argument in favor of following Library of Congress practice which is stronger than any reasons that could be offered for divergences from its practice. Hence, the Library of Congress, as the citadel, must be captured if victory is to be won. But this means that, however cogent the conclusions reached in this paper, we are left with a series of unanswered questions. Should present catalogs be frozen and

new ones started? Should recataloging be undertaken? Should entries according to the new rules be filed in with older entries?

Whatever the answers to these questions, I am certain of one thing: If we allow the weight of the past to stifle change and progress, however advantageous and justified, we shall indeed become the caricatures which form the stereotype of a librarian in the public mind.

GOVERNMENTS, SOCIETIES, AND INSTITUTIONS

As a major part of its work for the Office of Naval Research, the Science and Technology Project of the Library of Congress is required to conduct research and experimentation in methods of handling scientific information—a field that has come to be known as that of “scientific documentation.” A general account of this field of activity, with some mention of current research and experimentation being carried on in the Science and Technology Project and in other organizations, is contained in a paper¹ presented before the 1948 autumn general meeting of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia. More specific accounts of the work of the Project have also appeared. A paper setting forth certain new developments in subject heading and in indexing was presented by Mr. C. D. Gull of the Project's staff before the science-technology group of the Special Libraries Association, in Washington, on June 11, 1948. Mr. Gull's paper has since been issued with some modifications as the Introduction to the *Science and Technology Project List of Sub-*

ject Headings.² A paper on our methods of producing catalog cards, bulletins, and indexes from one typed copy appeared in the July, 1948, issue of *College and Research Libraries*.³ The present paper will describe an outstanding development in the simplification and rationalization of cataloging techniques resulting from the research and experimentation carried on in the Project.

In order to bring certain common problems of scientific documentation to the attention of the several government agencies concerned with them, the Project held a conference in September, 1947, devoted to the bibliographical control of government scientific and technical reports. The memorandum which formed the basis of this conference has also been published.⁴ It is referred to here, since the topics set forth in the memorandum indicate those fields in which research and experimentation are being conducted under the Science and Technology Project. The balance of this paper will be concerned with the conclusions so far attained by the Project with reference to one of these topics: the problem of determining uniquely, for the purpose of identification, the catalog entry for government scientific and technical reports. The meaning and limitation of this topic are perhaps best expressed by the following statement from the memorandum:

To catalog is to describe uniquely. The notion of unique description is difficult to explain and may differ according to different require-

² Washington, 1948.

³ M. Taube, “The Planning and Preparation of the Technical Information Pilot and Its Cumulative Index,” *College and Research Libraries*, IX (July, 1948), 202-6.

⁴ M. Taube, “Memorandum for a Conference on Bibliographical Control of Government Scientific and Technical Reports,” *Special Libraries*, XXXIX (May-June, 1948), 154-60.

¹ M. Taube, “New Tools for the Control and Use of Research Materials,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, XCIII, No. 10 (June, 1949), 248-52.

ments. In general, a unique description enables one to recognize and identify the item or class of items so described and to differentiate it from other items or classes not covered or excluded by the description. Thus, a catalog of rare books or prints might attempt to describe exhaustively particular items so that each item can be identified and distinguished from all other items however similar.

Ordinary library cataloging of books is concerned with classes of items, i.e., with identifying titles or editions, each one of which may have many copies. Hence, a catalog card prepared for a book in the Library of Congress usually serves for copies of the same book in many different libraries. But even this ordinary library cataloging is called upon to identify uniquely one title out of millions or one edition out of hundreds, and it has been [thought] necessary to develop elaborate cataloging codes to regulate and guide such descriptions.

It has, therefore, seemed to many that the complexities of library cataloging were not germane to the problem of cataloging scientific and technical reports. In one sense, this supposition has been justified. Given a handful of reports with no problem of different editions, it seemed unnecessary to concern oneself with the niceties and minutia of cataloging. Words on a cover or title page might be copied in the order given, or omitted if their importance to the description was not immediately manifest; or titles could be made up or supplied to fit an intra office filing system. Unfortunately, the number of reports multiplied, and once filed, could not be found or identified; citations could not be identified and verified and the product of research was lost in masses of undifferentiated paper.

Under these circumstances many agencies sought solutions in mechanical sorting and finding devices, only to realize that a machine can select or sort only those things properly cataloged, coded or described and hence, proper descriptions have become the first order of business.

There is required a code for cataloging scientific reports. Such a code should be detailed, as is required by the material to be cataloged—it need not and should not be more so.⁵

Although it may seem at first glance that descriptive cataloging, as contrasted

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 157-58.

with subject cataloging or indexing, is or should be a relatively simple and straightforward affair, there are certain problems not always apparent to those who lack firsthand experience with the difficulty of devising uniform entries from the haphazard information which appears on the title-pages of the various publications and reports requiring organization. An appreciation of this difficulty can be gained from the fact that almost all publishers of scientific books and journals find it necessary to issue rules for bibliographical citation to their contributors. But there is a more dramatic demonstration of the problem. Appendix I of the *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for 1946* offers a justification for the estimates for 1947 which the librarian presented to Congress. It contains a table showing the "estimate of man-years required to catalog fully 100,000 foreign language titles in one year."⁶ According to this table, the ratio of descriptive catalogers to subject catalogers is between five and six to one. This means that, in terms of present practice in the Library of Congress, six times as much manpower is devoted to describing books (i.e., setting forth author, title, pagination, etc.) as is devoted to determining what the books are about by classifying them and indicating the proper subjects under which they are to be cataloged. It means, further, that descriptive cataloging is the great bottleneck in the Library's attempts to control its collections and that the cost of descriptive cataloging is one of the most serious problems facing library administrators whose libraries follow Library of

⁶ *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for 1946* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1947), pp. 386-87. Since the limitation of this table to material in foreign languages applies to both descriptive and subject cataloging, the limitation does not affect the ratio of one to the other.

Congress practice. This includes most of the major research libraries of the United States.

It is hoped that the seriousness of the problem has been demonstrated; at the same time, it must be emphasized that the solution cannot be found in a blind rejection of the complexities of descriptive cataloging. One of the largest cataloging and abstracting services in the country neglected to establish its descriptive cataloging on a reasoned basis and found itself requesting material already in its files, cataloging different copies of the same items several times, and breaking up series of reports by cataloging under different names reports by the same authors.

In the face of this situation the Science and Technology Project as one of its first activities instituted certain experiments in descriptive cataloging, having made a thorough search of the literature on the subject for the purpose of developing a type of descriptive cataloging which would be adequate to the needs of the Project and which would not be prohibitively expensive. It was hoped, further, that the rules of cataloging developed in the Project might be applicable beyond the Project and thus constitute a contribution to the problem of cataloging in general. We realized that it would be necessary to develop not only a more expeditious method of cataloging but one which would answer the needs of major research libraries, including the Library of Congress itself. It can be reported at this time that, although many problems remain unsolved, we have been successful to a degree far beyond our initial expectations. We have developed certain rules and techniques which radically reduce the cost of cataloging, and, what is more important, the product of our cataloging is believed to be more logical,

more consistent, and easier to use than that resulting from the more elaborate A.L.A. catalog rules.

The ratio of descriptive-cataloging cost to subject-cataloging cost in the Library of Congress is, as we have already noted, between five and six to one. In the 1947 estimates the average time required to perform descriptive cataloging is given as two hours and twenty minutes per title, or three books per cataloger in a seven-hour day. Within the last two years there has been a real effort to lower costs and increase production, and the Library is gathering figures which will indicate how much has been accomplished. But it is unfortunately true that the savings are being made by lowering standards rather than by eliminating complexities and furbishings which have little relation to the bibliographical adequacy of the resultant product. In the Science and Technology Project three catalogers handle an average of sixty titles a day, or twenty titles per day per cataloger.⁷ The difference in cost need not be labored here; it may be argued that the cost difference is not significant because the purposes of and conditions prevailing in the Science and Technology Project are quite different from those in the Descriptive Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress. But such a general disclaimer need not concern us if the balance of our claim can be made good, namely, that the cataloging techniques and rules developed in the Science and Technology Project can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the general cataloging activity of the Library and that, if they are so applied, the resultant product will be bibliograph-

⁷ In addition to cataloging incoming material, the descriptive catalogers in the Science and Technology Project search all incoming material to eliminate duplicates, file temporary cards, and maintain the regular and permanent catalogs of the Project.

ically more consistent, more logical, and easier to use.

It is unfortunately true that a reasoned and logical explanation for present cataloging practice cannot be found. Miss Julia Pettee, one of the leading figures in American cataloging and a member of the committee which prepared the new edition of the A.L.A. code, has stated: "Since Cutter's first edition of *Rules* there has been no further development in principles, though an enormous amount of work has been done in amplifying, codifying and clarifying rules. . . ."⁸

Further, Miss Pettee expresses the belief that the foundation for the present Anglo-American rules for the corporate entry can be found in Sir Anthony Panizzi's rules for the compilation of the 1841 catalog of the British Museum. Panizzi's Rule 9 states: ⁱ

Any act, resolution or other document purporting to be agreed upon, authorized, or issued by assemblies, boards, or corporate bodies (with the exception of academies, universities, learned societies, and religious orders, respecting which special rules are to be followed) to be entered in distinct alphabetical series, under the name of the country or place from which they derive their denomination, or for want of such denominations, under the name of the place whence their acts are issued.⁹

The publications of academies, universities, learned societies, etc., are also, according to Panizzi's Rule 80, to be "alphabetically entered according to the English name of the country and town at which the sittings of the society are held. . . ."¹⁰ But all publications of this

sort are grouped by Panizzi under the general heading "Academies," and entry under locality follows this general heading.

Now in the case of Panizzi, as with other rule-makers to be considered, it is noteworthy that these rules are presented without justification or argument. We can assume that Panizzi had what seemed to him excellent reasons for these rules, and any cataloger could undoubtedly think of several based on his own experience. But in the last analysis we can only guess at the considerations which seemed determinative to Panizzi, since, ten years later, in this country, Jewett presented a rule which without exception called for the entry of works by corporate authors under the corporate name rather than under place:

Academies, institutes, associations, universities, colleges; literary, scientific, economical, eleemosynary, or religious societies; national and municipal governments; assemblies, conventions, boards, corporations, or other bodies of men under whatever name, and for whatever purpose, issuing publications whether of separate works, or of continuous series, under a general title, are to be considered and treated as the authors of all works issued by them, and in their name alone. The heading is to be the name of the body, the principal word to be the first word, not an article.¹¹

There is a curious anomaly in these two rules in that, for publications of one kind of corporate bodies (governments), even though the rules are opposite in intention, they issue in identical entries. The reason is that certain proper names are at the same time names of places and names of governments. Thus, Panizzi enters a report by the Burgomaster of Antwerp under "Antwerp. Burgomaster. . . ." According to Jewett, such a report

⁸ Julia Pettee, "The Development of Authorship Entry and the Formulation of Authorship Rules as Found in the Anglo-American Code," *Library Quarterly*, VI (July, 1936), 270-90.

⁹ *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books* (London, 1841), I, v.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. ix.

¹¹ C. C. Jewett, *On the Construction of Catalogues of Libraries, and of a General Catalogue* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1852), p. 42.

would also be entered as "Antwerp. Burgomaster . . .," but in Jewett's entry "Antwerp" would not be considered as the name of a place but as the name of a corporate body. This is made clear in the explanation which Jewett appends to his Rule 21:

When committees or branches of a body issue publications the heading is to be the name of the Chief, and not of the subordinate body. Thus under "United States" would be placed all public documents issued at the expense of the United States whether as regular Public Documents, or by particular Departments, Bureaus, or Committees.¹³

Cutter seemingly reintroduces Panizzi's rule, although he is not always careful to distinguish between a term used as the name of a place and the same term used as the name of a government. He states as a general principle that "bodies of men are to be considered as authors of works published in their name or by their authority." But his first rule under this principle is:

Enter under places (countries or parts of countries, cities, towns, ecclesiastical, military, or judicial districts) the works published officially by their RULERS (kings, governors, mayors, prelates, generals commanding, courts, etc.). Refer from the name of the ruler.¹⁴

From this rule and from several others (e.g., 47, 48, 50), we would assume that Cutter followed Panizzi, but from still others (e.g., 58) he seems to be following Jewett.

It may be said that, if both rules lead to similar entries, there is no point in deciding between them, but the issue cannot be disposed of so easily; for when we come to the problem of subdivisions of government agencies, Cutter's recommendation for the treatment of subdivisions is only valid if we regard the "U.S."

as the name of a place and not as the name of a corporate body. Cutter's Rule 49 tells that "reports by a subordinate office to a department go under the office making the report."¹⁴ In the example which he gives we are told that reports of the Bureau of Insular Affairs are to be entered directly under "United States," i.e., "U.S. Bureau of Insular Affairs" and not "U.S. War Dept. Bureau of Insular Affairs." Now, if "U.S." is a place name, the omission of "War Dept." makes sense, since the rule then tells us to enter publications of the Bureau of Insular Affairs under the place. But if "U.S." is part of the name of the corporate body, what logic justifies us in leaving out one part of the name, i.e., "War Dept.," and retaining a more general part of the name, i.e., "U.S."? It seems clear, therefore, that most of the time Cutter regarded "U.S." as a place name and not as the name of a corporate body.

This confusion is still apparent in the American Library Association's *Anglo-American Catalog Rules*, both the 1908 and the 1941 (second) edition.¹⁵ There is, on one hand, ample evidence that names like "U.S.," "France," etc. are regarded as names of governments and not of places, as in the entries "U.S. Navy Yard, Boston," or "U.S. Consulate, Antwerp." On the other hand, the 1908 and 1941 *Rules* follow Cutter in entering subordinate offices directly under "U.S.," as, for example, "U.S. National Cancer Institute" instead of "U.S. Federal Security Agency Public Health Service. National Institutes of Health. National Cancer Institute," a practice which could be logically defended only if "U.S." were interpreted as a place name.

A question must naturally intrude at

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ C. A. Cutter, *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog* (4th ed.; Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), p. 41.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

¹⁶ These two publications will be hereafter referred to as the "1908 *Rules*" and the "1941 *Rules*."

this point: If it is permissible to drop the names "Federal Security Agency," "Public Health Service," and "National Institutes of Health," why can we not drop the name "U.S." and use only "National Cancer Institute"? To a question of this sort the average practicing cataloger would make either or both of the following answers: In the first place, it might be said that "U.S." is necessary to distinguish the National Cancer Institute in this country from one in England or in Canada, if there should be one. [This answer presupposes a plurality of institutes with the same name, and this may not be the case. But even if it is, we can make the distinction parenthetically as follows: "National Cancer Institute (U.S.," and "National Cancer Institute (Gt. Britain)."] Aside from the superior logic of this form of entry,¹⁶ it helps to eliminate the cluttering of entries under local or government names.] Second, it may be argued that the name "U.S." is necessary in order to bring together in the catalog all United States official publications. [Aside from the fact that it is not self-evidently clear why it is necessary to bring together all United States publications and not necessary to bring together all Federal Security Agency or Public Health Service publications, it is not generally realized that the 1941 *Rules*, as contrasted with those of 1908, introduced the principle that, if possible, official publications should not be entered under the name of the governments which issued them.]

The specific and basic rule covering official publications in the 1908 *Rules* is that "governments (states, provinces, municipalities, ecclesiastical, military, or judicial districts) are to be considered as

authors of their official publication."¹⁷ In the 1941 *Rules*, however, the specification undergoes a radical change. It begins the same way, but then it continues:

Certain classes of institutions and other bodies created, maintained, controlled or owned by governments are, however, to be treated according to the rules governing these bodies as authors, e.g., colleges, universities, schools, libraries, museums, galleries, observatories, agricultural experiment stations, hospitals, asylums, prisons, theaters, chambers of commerce, botanical and zoological gardens, banks, business corporations, churches, societies, etc.¹⁸

The use of the phrase "certain classes" serves, either unintentionally or intentionally, to disguise the revolutionary implications of this specification; for, in effect, the specification tells us that, if any agency, institution, or body is covered by a particular rule in addition to the general rule for official bodies, it is to be treated in accordance with the particular rule and not in accordance with the general rule. For example, publications of the national library of France are entered not, in accordance with the rule governing official publications, as "France. Bibliothèque Nationale" but, in accordance with the rule covering libraries and similar institutions, as "Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale." It is interesting to note that the institution which houses the national library of Great Britain is entered not under "Gt. Britain" or even under "London" but under its name directly, i.e., "British Museum," whereas the Library of Congress, which should be entered under "Washington, D.C. Library of Congress," is treated as an exception to

¹⁷ American Library Association and the (British) Library Association, *Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries* (American ed.; Chicago, 1908), p. 17.

¹⁸ American Library Association, *A.L.A. Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries* (prelim. American 2d ed.; Chicago, 1941), p. 79.

¹⁶ Logically superior because it is not constructed arbitrarily out of parts of the name.

the rules governing libraries and is entered under "U.S. Library of Congress."

This specification in the 1941 *Rules*, although revolutionary in its implications, merely sanctified practices which had developed in the Library of Congress between 1908 and 1941. In 1908, governments were relatively simple affairs, but a catalog department which witnessed the growth of our own government under the impact of a world war and the New Deal and which saw in the event of socialization and even socialism the possibility that all the publications of a country would be official and hence require entry under the name of the country might naturally, if not reasonably, search for devices and reasons to eliminate the growing mass of catalog entries under "U.S." or "Soviet Union" or "France" or "England." And although their practice was not sanctified until the appearance of the 1941 *Rules*, the Library of Congress catalogers followed the general practice of not treating a publication as official if it could be treated, under some other rule, as the publication of a college, library, botanical garden, museum, or similar institution.

The Library of Congress practice in this regard was first set forth in 1934 by James B. Childs, then chief of the Division of Documents, in a paper on "Author Entry for Government Publications."¹⁹ The rules set forth in this paper were later incorporated almost word for word in the 1941 *Rules*. Dr. J. C. M. Hanson, the editor of the 1908 *Rules*, in commenting on the changes introduced by Mr. Childs, supports the interpreta-

tion we have given in the previous paragraph. Thus he says:

... He [Mr. Childs] calls attention to one feature to which few librarians have given much thought. It is the increasing number of institutions, commissions, and organizations of various kinds wholly or in part supported by government funds. To enter all of them under country would obviously lead to an almost intolerable congestion of divisions and subdivisions under the names of large countries. Moreover, it would place the entries where the average person could hardly be expected to look for them.²⁰

But if entry under the name of a country or any other jurisdiction is not required to distinguish between institutions of the same name, if it is not used to bring together all official publications of a government, if it does tend to lead to an almost intolerable congestion of divisions and subdivisions under the names of large countries, and if it would place entries where the average person could hardly be expected to look for them, why not eliminate such entries altogether? The answer is that it is possible: We can eliminate the whole collection of special rules for government publications and treat all publications of government bodies under the general rules pertaining to institutions and societies. However, this simplification, drastic as it is in principle, does not carry us very far toward a simplified and more logical practice. Jewett's Rule 21 does not distinguish between societies and institutions, but the 1941 *Rules* do and, by so doing, succeed, as we shall see, in introducing a great many unnecessary complexities.

In the 1941 *Rules* the general rule for institutions (Rule 150) is as follows: "Enter an institution (using the latest name) under the name of the place in which it is

¹⁹ J. B. Childs, "The Author Entry for Government Publications," *Public Documents: Their Selection, Distribution, Cataloging, Reproduction and Preservation: Papers Presented at the 1934 Conference of the American Library Association* (Chicago, 1935), pp. 103-28.

²⁰ J. C. M. Hanson, "Corporate Authorship versus Title Entry," *Library Quarterly*, V (October, 1935), 457-66.

located."²¹ This rule is followed by one which states a general exception:

Enter an institution of the United States or of the British empire whose name begins with a proper noun or a proper adjective under the first word of its name and refer from the place where it is located. Add the name of the place to the heading if it does not occur in the name of the institution unless the institution is so well known as to make the addition of the place unnecessary. For countries other than the United States and the British empire follow the general rule of entry under place.²²

The entry "Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale" is in accord with Rule 150; the entry "British Museum" is in accord with Rule 151.

The 1941 *Rules's* general rule for societies (103) is contrary to that for institutions and provides for entry under the name of the society: "Enter a society under the first word (not an article) of its latest corporate name, with reference from any other name by which it is known, and from the name of the place where its headquarters are established."²³ It will be seen that Rule 103 agrees with Rule 151, and thus we are left with only one major group of entries which are entered under place, namely, those institutions whose names do not begin with a proper noun or adjective. Now, if we ask why this distinction is made between those institutions whose names do and those whose do not begin with a proper noun or adjective, the rules are silent. Presumably the rule-makers believed that institutions lacking proper names would have to be distinguished by place, although, as we have shown above, it is very easy to make any necessary distinctions parenthetically or after the entry, wherever several institutions have the same name. Thus, if there is a Bibliothè-

que Nationale in Paris and one in Brussels, we can indicate as much after the name, without requiring our catalogers to make a theoretical and tenuous distinction between institutions and societies.

We are fortunate in this instance, however, in having available to us a discussion of the reason for the distinctive treatment of institutions and societies prepared by Miss Clara Beetle, head of the Foreign Language Section of the Descriptive Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress. Professor J. Frédéric Finó has proposed a general rule which eliminates the arbitrary distinction between institutions and societies and provides for entry under the name of the society or institution. Miss Beetle opposed Professor Finó's proposal in a written statement, which he reprinted in his *Encabezamientos de entes colectivos*.²⁴ In summing up her position, Miss Beetle says:

The chief objections to entry of all organizations . . . directly under their names would be 1) the expense and inconvenience of change of entry for institutions especially in long established libraries; 2) confusion caused to librarians and readers accustomed to present forms; 3) absence of proof that the change would agree with the natural approach of new readers; 4) concentration of similar names in long files which would prove difficult to use; 5) new problems created in regard to entry of institutions practically unknown by their names.²⁵

The first two objections need not concern us at this point, except to note that Miss Beetle should have left them out of her summation because, in beginning her argument, she says: "Disregarding the practical question of the expense of change and the delay in new work resulting from recataloging projects, we may consider [Professor Finó's] proposal from

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 131.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 132-33.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

²⁴ Buenos Aires, 1948.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

a theoretical standpoint." We can proceed immediately to Miss Beetle's third objection, namely, the "absence of proof that the change [having one rule for societies and institutions] would agree with the natural approach of new readers." It is an accepted principle of science, first enunciated by Ockham, that, all things being equal, the simpler explanation is the truer. The burden of proof is not on Professor Finó (who proposes to get along on one rule for corporate bodies, whether societies or institutions) but on Miss Beetle or anyone else who contends that the one rule is not enough and that two or more are needed. As for the reader, who ninety-nine times out of a hundred has not the vaguest idea of the difference between institutions and societies as defined by the A.L.A. *Rules*, surely it is more natural for him to look for the publications of all corporate bodies under their names, and that is how he would find them if we used one rule for both societies and institutions. The present rules call for entering the publications of societies under the name of the society and for entering the publications of institutions not under their names but under the names of the *locations* of the institutions. Since even experienced catalogers have difficulty distinguishing between societies and institutions, it would not help a reader to be required to make such a distinction before he could look in a catalog for the publications of either societies or institutions.

In her fourth objection Miss Beetle tells us that the elimination of entry under place would result in a "concentration of similar names in long files which would prove difficult to use." This objection cannot be taken seriously, since it is universally conceded that the present concentration of entries in the catalog

under place names constitutes the most difficult part of the catalog not only for the reader but for the trained reference assistant.

The fifth and final objection, namely, that "new problems [are] created in regard to entry of institutions practically unknown by their names," is an excellent example of the complications and inconsistencies occasioned by a set of rules which lack a theoretical basis. We have pointed out above that, in the 1941 *Rules*, Rule 150 provides for entry of institutions under place and Rule 151, as a general exception, provides for the entry of institutions whose names begin with proper nouns or adjectives directly under their names. Now, Rule 153 makes an exception to the general exception and tells us that, when the official name of an institution is practically unknown, even though the official name begins with a proper noun or adjective, it is to be entered under place.²⁶ It is this rule which forms the basis of Miss Beetle's fifth objection. But in the face of all the rules which tell us to disregard common practice and knowledge in the interests of a higher consistency, this rule is almost catastrophic in its implications for present practices. The whole structure of research which forms the intellectual basis of Library of Congress cataloging would be in danger of disintegrating (perhaps a consummation devoutly to be wished) if we were to follow a general rule to avoid entry under unknown names. Miss Pet-tee, writing in 1936 about the forthcoming (1941) edition of the A.L.A. *Rules*, says:

In the changes that are made the conciliatory policy of establishing headings which are most likely to be looked for in our English and American libraries will have less weight. The Library of Congress is effectively weaning

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 135.

us from this earlier practice. Who but a cataloger would look for Tagore under Ravindranatha Thakura. . . .²⁷

In the face of this statement that both the A.L.A. *Rules* and Library of Congress practice allow little weight to the policy of using entries likely to be known to the reader, Miss Beetle's fifth objection, like the first four, has no force.

The conclusion seems clear that, if these five objections are all that can be mustered in favor of present complexities, Professor Finó's proposal, and our own, to enter all organizations under their names has nothing against it and every recommendation for it.

At this point, before going on to state a positive program, a recapitulation is in order. We began by pointing out the cost of cataloging, and we have attempted to show that this cost is occasioned in large measure by a set of rules which are needlessly complicated and inconsistent. An analysis of the development of the rules for official entries in Panizzi, Jewett, Cutter, Childs, and the A.L.A. *Rules* of 1908 and 1941 indicated that the publications of official bodies should be entered under the names of the bodies responsible for them and that the name of the country or government need not precede the name of the body in the entry. This implied that the publications of official bodies could be treated according to the general rules for corporate bodies and need not be made the subject of specific rules. The next step was to show that there was no need for the distinction between societies and institutions, and we were thus brought to the conclusion that one general rule or scheme of rules for the publications of corporate bodies, whether governments, societies, or institutions, is a practical objective.

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 288.

SUBDIVISIONS UNDER CORPORATE BODIES

Perhaps the most difficult problem that any rules of entry are called upon to solve is that of subdivision. We have already given some indication of the nature of this problem in our discussion of the entry for publications of the National Cancer Institute. But it is necessary, at this point, to consider the matter in full detail. In the explanatory note which Jewett appends to his rule for corporate bodies he says:

When committees or branches of a body issue publications, the heading is to be the name of the chief, and not of the subordinate body. Thus, under "United States" would be placed all public documents issued at the expense of the United States, whether as regular Public Documents, or by particular Departments, Bureaus, or Committees. Such titles, when they become numerous, may be subdivided, and conveniently arranged in the catalogue.²⁸

Here Jewett seems undisturbed by the problem of subdivision, but twenty-five years later and long before the Library of Congress catalog contained, as it does now, 212 drawers of entries under "U.S.," Cutter perceived some of the problems of subdivision and tried to cope with them. His Rule 49 is quite simple and straightforward: "Reports by a subordinate office to a department go under the office making the report."²⁹ There seems no difficulty here, and Cutter's Rule 324 is likewise direct and seems to offer no difficulties: "In arranging [making the entry] government publications make all necessary divisions but avoid subdivision."³⁰ But in the explanation appended to this rule Cutter manages to introduce the serpent into the garden. "There are," he says, "certain divisions or sections

²⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 42.

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 42.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

which have no independent existence and should be subordinated, as *Division of Statistics* under several departments or bureaus, and the various divisions of the Library of Congress (as *Catalog division*, *Order division*).³¹ This seemingly innocent qualification might have justified Cutter in saying, "après moi le déluge," for by it he confronted American catalogers with the metaphysical problem of "independent existence," to be solved anew each time a cataloger had to deal with the division of a corporate body. One has only to examine the mass of inconsistencies among "U.S." entries in the Library of Congress to be convinced that the catalogers were no more successful in solving the metaphysical problem of independent existence than were most of the philosophers from Plato's day to our own. And the cream of the jest is that, even when successfully utilized, the criterion of "independent existence" has no bibliographical significance, and its results serve only to bewilder the users of the catalog.

The Library of Congress enters publications of its Legislative Reference Service under the heading "U.S. Library of Congress. Legislative Reference Service." On the other hand, it enters publications of the Copyright Office, which occupies an identical position in the Library's administrative structure, under "U.S. Copyright Office." The justification for this difference is supposedly found in the fact that before 1870 the Copyright Office was independent of the Library. Before the user of the catalog can find the proper entry, not only has he to know what offices now have or do not have "independent existence," but he must be familiar with the administrative history of each office. And the cataloger must also gain this knowledge at consid-

erable cost in time and money, before he can properly succeed in mystifying the poor untutored user of the catalog.

The 1908 edition of the *Rules* avoids the concept of independent existence concerning the subdivision of official agencies and substitutes the concept of "minor divisions and offices [which] are usually to be subordinated to the bureaus or departments of which they form a part."³² But the cataloger is still confronted with the task of determining what is major and what is minor and, beyond that, how often is "usually"; for, in accordance with this rule, a minor division or office should in some cases not be subordinated to the bureau or department of which it forms a part. Manifestly, a rule which permits you to do something in two ways and gives no criterion to enable the user to select one way or the other is not very serviceable.

However, the 1908 rule for subdivisions under a university reintroduces the concept of independent existence:

Enter the colleges of a British university and the professional schools which form an *integral* part of an American university under the name of the university with the name of the college or school as subheading. . . . Professional schools whose names begin with a proper noun or adjective may be entered under their own names particularly if they are situated at a distance from the university of which they form a part, have merely a nominal connection with it, or for other reasons are unlikely to be looked for under its name. Cases in point are some American schools which, originally independent, have later affiliated with or become departments of a university.³³

We will not stop at this point to give examples of the kind of difficulties which resulted from this rule but will remark only that it is a good example of the intrusion into cataloging theory and practice of matters which are bibliographical-

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

³² *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

ly irrelevant. In the 1941 *Rules*, to which we again turn, the rules concerning subdivision reach an apotheosis of meaningless confusion. The first part of Rule 72 repeats, in essence, Cutter's Rule 49 and the first part of the 1908 Rule 58: "Enter government bureaus or offices subordinate to an executive agency, ministry or secretariat directly under the name of the jurisdiction, not as a subheading under the department, ministry or secretariat."³⁴

The second part of this rule, which states when subdivision should be used, reads as follows: "But divisions, regional offices and other units of departments, bureaus, commissions, etc., subordinate to these departments, bureaus, commissions, etc., are usually entered as subheadings to the departments, bureaus, commissions, etc."³⁵ We may note that the concepts of "independent existence" and "major and minor" have been eliminated and, further, that the first part of the rule mentions bureaus, offices, departments, ministries, and secretariats, whereas the second part of the rule mentions divisions, regional offices, other units, departments, bureaus, and commissions. Now we can safely assume that the decision as to what is subordinated to what does not depend on the use of words like "division," "department," "office," "commission," etc. If it did, the rule would be meaningless in relation to foreign agencies and would not be in accord with actual cataloging practice. But if we eliminate this merely verbal difference between the two parts of the rule and concern ourselves with their essential meaning, then the first part tells us only that some government offices are entered directly under the name of the jurisdiction and not under other offices to which they are subordinate, and the sec-

ond part of the rule tells us that some government offices are *not* entered directly under the name of the jurisdiction but under other offices to which they are subordinate. But since the rule does not tell us when to do it one way and when the other, it is utterly useless as a rule of procedure. In these circumstances, we cannot even allege an inconsistency in the present method of cataloging publications of subordinate offices because, no matter how they are cataloged, it will be in accordance with the rule.

The 1941 *Rules* enlarge upon the 1908 *Rules* with respect to subdivision under institutions and give more emphasis to exceptions. Rule 158 tells us to "enter the various faculties, colleges, professional schools, laboratories, libraries, museums, observatories, hospitals, shops, etc., which form an integral part of a university or other institution under the larger institution with the name of the particular entity as subheading."³⁶ Among others, the following entries are given as instances exemplifying this rule: "Oxford. University. Balliol college" and "Wisconsin. University. Washburn observatory." But "exception may be made," the rule goes on to say, "in the case of an observatory which is much more likely to be looked for under its own name than under that of the place or of the institution of which it forms a part."³⁷ As one example of such exceptions, there is listed "Allegheny observatory," which is not to be subordinated under Allegheny, Pennsylvania, its location, or Western University of Pennsylvania, of which it is a part. We are not told *why* one would be more likely to look for one observatory under its name and for another under the university of which it is a part.

Exception (b) under Rule 158 in the

³⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

1941 *Rules* is identical with the exception under Rule 42 in the 1908 *Rules*. And as an example of a college which should be entered under its name rather than as a subdivision under the university of which it is a part, it gives "Barnard college."

Thus, even though the College of Physicians and Surgeons, for example, was founded and for years existed independently of Columbia University, its publications are entered under "Columbia university. College of physicians and surgeons." We will be told that "College" is not a proper name and that, therefore, the direct entry for Barnard is justified, whereas a direct entry for College of Physicians and Surgeons is not. But if the direct entry is right for Barnard, why not for Balliol? With this last rhetorical question we can turn to the more rewarding task of presenting the way in which the Science and Technology Project attempted to meet the problems and difficulties thus far set forth.

THE SEARCH FOR CONSISTENT RULES

The manner in which the Science and Technology Project arrived at its rules of entry can be better understood if one considers first certain problems which were solved in connection with its subject-heading list. We wished to create a subject-heading list which would be consistent in principle and based on a minimum number of rules. We believed that consistency in accordance with a small number of rules would make the work easier for our subject catalogers, but our chief concern was for the users of our catalog. The same few rules used by the catalogers could also be explained to the users of the catalog, and, if the catalog exemplified these rules consistently, it would follow that the user could find his way around in the catalog with maximum ease. The measure of our success in

this effort is set forth in the *Science and Technology Project List of Subject Headings*.

In our search for consistency and simplicity for the user's sake, we considered whether or not any of the generally accepted principles of subject headings were applicable to the field of descriptive cataloging. The Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Division and the Science and Technology Project agree in following the principle of direct and specific headings. This means that a work on analytical geometry is entered under the subject heading "Analytical geometry" and not under the heading "Mathematics—Geometry—Analytical." However, sometimes even the most specific heading seems to require subdivision, as, for example, "Accelerometers—Mathematical analysis" and "Fibers—Fatigue." But it is a general rule in the Project that terms chosen as subdivisions rather than as specific entries must be capable of being subdivisions of many specific entries. Thus we have: "Aerial targets—Performance," "Rocket launchers—Performance," and "Turbojet engines—Performance."

Since these subdivisions are intended to be used under many different specific entries, both the Library of Congress proper and the Science and Technology Project maintain internally and have published lists of subject subdivisions to be used whenever suitable. From time to time new subdivisions are developed as they are required, and they are added to the existing lists. A subject cataloger does not have to guess whether or not a phrase or term can be used as a subdivision: he searches the list for it. If it is not on the list and he still wishes to use it, it must pass inspection not only for a particular and present use but for addition to the list for general and regular use.

When it came to the problem of descriptive entry, it was only natural to ask in the first instance whether or not the rule of specific entry, which seemed to work so well with reference to subject headings, could also be applied to this field. Any general rule applicable to both subject headings and author entries would, as we have said, *ipso facto* introduce the desired consistency in the overall task of cataloging.³⁸ Hence we set forth as our first rule of entry that the entry must be the specific agency or corporate body responsible for the report.³⁹ This rule provided that a publication of the National Cancer Institute should be cataloged under "National Cancer Institute" and not under "U.S. Federal Security Agency. Public Health Service. National Institutes of Health. National Cancer Institute." Our second rule holds that the specific agency responsible for the publication, and under which entry is to be made, is determined by information contained in the work being cataloged. The form of the entry given on the title-page or elsewhere in the work being cataloged may be modified in the entry only if a different form has already been established and used in the catalog. It can be seen that, taken together, these rules render unnecessary much of the research which is currently eating up the cataloging budget of the Library of Congress. Nor must it be supposed that by eliminating the research which is now presumably required to determine the

proper entry and its form we are in any way advocating lower standards of cataloging; for here is what may be described as the great hoax of American cataloging practice: Research into the financial structure of an agency, in order to determine that its publications are properly entered under "U.S. Naval Asylum. Philadelphia" instead of under "Philadelphia Naval Asylum" (or, in the case of another agency, that its publications are properly entered under "Philadelphia. Naval Home" instead of "U.S. Naval Home. Philadelphia") may result in making cataloging consistent with budget statements, but it certainly introduces bibliographical inconsistencies into the catalog and results in a differentiation among forms of entry which is meaningless, if not actually confusing, to even the most erudite users of the catalog.

Although we arrived at our second rule independently, our investigations into cataloging theory and history disclosed that a similar rule was first promulgated by the British Museum in 1900.

The choice of a heading for a main entry must be based on the information supplied in print in a perfect copy of the book itself, and on that only. An exception may be made in the case of reprints of recognized classics, where the author's name may be taken as the heading of the main entry, though it be not given in the book; e.g., a reprint of the *Divina Commedia* without the author's name should be cataloged under Dante, and a reprint of *Robinson Crusoe* under Defoe. But such cases are rare and very exceptional.⁴⁰

It should be borne in mind that the motivation responsible for this rule is not a desire to save money or even to simplify cataloging but to insure against the intrusion into cataloging of bibliographically irrelevant information.

³⁸ Cutter also accepted the rule of specific entry for both subject and author entries. He believed that the use of specific entries in both categories was the essential mark of a dictionary catalog. This means that he departed from his own principles when, in certain instances, he advocated entries under place, in effect a device more suitable to a classed catalog.

³⁹ The rules presented below in the text are restated in Appendix I.

⁴⁰ British Museum, *Rules for Compiling the Catalogue in the Department of Printed Books at the British Museum* (London, 1900), Rule 4.

Our rule goes beyond the British Museum rule, although it is not inconsistent with it, in permitting a change in the form given on the copy being cataloged, if such a change is necessary to achieve consistency with a form previously used in our catalog. While granting that our rule provides for the internal consistency of our own catalog, one may argue that such consistency is not enough and that we should attempt to attain consistency between our catalog and the catalogs of other libraries. It may be said, further, that this wider consistency can be achieved if we are willing to consider previous entries not only in our own catalog but in other catalogs or in what are essentially the same things, reference books, printed bibliographies, indexes, etc. And it will be argued, finally, that this search for a consistent product by different catalogers in different places at different times justifies research beyond the book that is being cataloged and beyond previously established entries in any one library. In spite of a superficial plausibility, this whole argument is basically specious. Suppose that we agree to go beyond the book itself and beyond previously cataloged entries: How far do we go? It will be said that we should go to those reference books "readily at hand." But the reference books readily at hand in one institution may not be those readily at hand in another. And if different reference books are available in different institutions, we have no guaranty that a search through reference books will always produce identical entries. Indeed, our experience with co-operative cataloging ventures has demonstrated down to the hilt that catalogers in other institutions, following A.L.A. rules and using the reference books available to them, do not always produce entries equivalent to the forms established

by the Library of Congress. The Processing Department of the Library has recently published the results of a study by the chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division which purports to show conclusively that we cannot without checking and revision accept the entries supplied by other libraries.

Furthermore, the recent decision of the Army Medical Library and the Library of Congress to break off co-operative cataloging relations was occasioned in part by the realization that, unless the Army Medical Library was willing to use the Library of Congress official catalog in establishing authors (a practice which the Army Medical Library could not afford), the entries supplied by the Army Medical Library would not be consistent with those established by the Library of Congress itself. And it did not matter, in this connection, that the Army Medical Library was willing to follow our rules of entry and to use all reference books they thought necessary. Hence, unless we are willing to specify a common list of reference books to be used by all co-operating libraries each time an author entry is to be established, we have no reason to expect a gain in consistency by going beyond the sources allowed by Rule 2 of the Science and Technology Project.⁴¹

Our third rule concerns the subdivisions of corporate bodies whose names are not suitable for entries. It is obvious that certain kinds of administrative

⁴¹ In actual practice inconsistencies of entries as between libraries are usually occasioned not by the use of different reference books but by the inconsistencies actually present in the rules being followed. Furthermore, maximum consistency would be insured by strict instructions to adopt the term of entry on the title-page. Such a rule would lead to the separation of works by a given author in any one catalog, but it would certainly insure that library A and library B would have the same entries for copies of the same book.

units are common to a great many agencies or corporate bodies and that, therefore, their names do not constitute acceptable entries. We refer to such names as "library," "personnel office," "information office," "department of physics," etc. This awareness undoubtedly led Cutter to allow exceptions to his rule of specific entry. Cutter's error and the error of the A.L.A. *Rules* consisted not in this recognition but in the attempt to supply a general description for the kind of names which should be treated as subdivisions. We can state categorically that such a description cannot be given. Hence the Science and Technology Project abandoned the attempt and sought a solution which differed in principle from all previous attempts. We solved this problem by establishing a list of unit names which are to be used as subdivisions and not as entries.

Thus, if we are confronted with a publication by the Yale University Department of Physics, our list will tell us that "Department of ——— under universities and colleges" is always a subdivision and never an entry. Similarly, if the National Cancer Institute has a library or a personnel office which issues publications, the list will tell us that the names of such offices are never entries and that entry should be made, therefore, under "National Cancer Institute." If we should be called upon to catalog a publication which is issued by a unit whose name we feel will not make a suitable⁴²

⁴² Names are regarded as not suitable for entries if they are completely general and nondescriptive. Thus "Library" is not suitable as an entry, whereas "Library of Congress" is. Now there obviously will be doubtful cases. Thus we may be certain that "Department of English" is not a suitable entry, but what about "Department of Agriculture" or "Radiation Laboratory (M.I.T.)"? The answer here is that *in principle* it does not matter what decision is made, so long as the decision is registered. Some decisions will be better than others in that they will

entry and if we then find that this name is not on our list of names to be used as subdivisions, one of two courses is open to us: We can either use the name as an entry or add it to our list and use it as a subdivision. It will be seen that in this practice, as in the rule of specific entry, we have sought and achieved a unification of theory of subject cataloging and descriptive cataloging.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the final section of this paper we shall present our three rules for corporate entries in a consecutive and systematic order. But before we do so, it will be helpful to summarize the manner in which cataloging according to our rules, as contrasted with present practice, will fulfil the claims made earlier in this paper:

1. Cataloging will be faster because a considerable portion of the research, beyond the book in hand and the record of material already cataloged, is eliminated.

2. Research beyond the book in hand and the record of material previously cataloged does not contribute materially to the achievement of consistent entries and does introduce into the cataloging process extraneous considerations relating to administrative history, law, financial structure, etc., which have no bibliographical significance for the users of the catalog.

3. The number of necessary rules has been reduced from over a hundred, plus that many more exceptions, to three rules with no exceptions.

4. By virtue of (1) and (3), the cost of cataloging can be substantially reduced.

result in more entries more easily found by more users of the catalog. But this aim cannot be expressed in a rule that would not beg the question.

Further comparative studies are necessary in order to arrive at a definite cost figure.

5. The elimination of exceptions and of the multiplicity of conflicting rules results in a more consistent and logical catalog. This point cannot be too strongly emphasized. Our primary concern has been to produce a better catalog. Our quarrel with present practice, therefore, is not that it is expensive but that it is uselessly so. In most of the literature on the cost of cataloging, catalogers have been arrayed against administrators. The latter have protested against high costs; the former have argued that simplification would destroy the scholarly character of cataloging. We should have realized, however, that the constant increase in complexity of catalog codes is a mark not of progress but of degeneration. Toynbee has reminded us lately that progress is always in the direction of simplification, of the larger generality and the more universal law; and in principle it does not matter whether the law concerns morals, physics, or so prosaic an affair as library cataloging.

6. Any user of a catalog who wishes to spare a few minutes' time can learn our rules of entry for corporate bodies and thus find his way around in any catalog constructed in accordance with these rules.

7. Similarly, catalogers can be trained in half a day to use our rules; thus the cost of cataloging in terms of high professional salaries will be considerably reduced.

In order to forestall precious and capricious criticism, we can admit at this point that there may be publications so unusual, with title-pages so misleading, and issued by corporate bodies so complex that they cannot be handled in accordance with our rules. Suppose we were to say that in such instances, if any, the cataloger could enter the publication in any way he pleases, provided that all necessary cross-references and authority cards are made. Such instances are not damaging to our general thesis unless they occur in a significant percentage of cases. We feel confident that they will not occur nearly so frequently as do exceptions to existing rules.

APPENDIX I

RULES FOR CORPORATE ENTRIES IN THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROJECT

Specification.—Academies, institutes, associations, universities, colleges, societies, government bodies, corporations or other collective bodies of men under whatever name are to be considered and treated as authors of their official reports, proceedings, and other publications for which they are collectively responsible.

Rule 1.—Enter the publications of a corporate entity under its name.

Rule 2.—The form of the name is to be determined by information available in the work being cataloged and in authority lists from

cataloging previous works and from these two sources only.

Rule 3.—If the title-page or other parts of the work being cataloged disclose that a division or part of a corporate body was responsible for the report, entry should be made under the division or part unless the *name* of the part is contained in a standard list of names not suitable for entries. In such cases entry is to be made under the next largest administrative unit or part. Names not suitable for entries may be used as subdivisions for filing purposes at the discretion of individual institutions.

APPENDIX II

A NOTE ON THE CHOICE BETWEEN CORPORATE,
PERSONAL, AND TITLE ENTRIES

Many of the American Library Association rules for corporate entry are concerned with the choice between a corporate entry and an author entry (in the case of a monographic work) or a title entry (in the case of a periodical issued by a corporate body). The application of these rules requires the cataloger to determine whether the piece being cataloged is a "routine" or "nonroutine" publication. Now, even if the cataloger could make this determination accurately at all times, the distinction has no value from the point of view of the user of the catalog. The rules themselves recognize this fact by directing in many instances that, if the

corporate name is chosen as the main entry, entry should also be made under the title or personal name, as the case may be, and vice versa.

The Science and Technology Project has solved this problem of making the general choice of corporate entry a matter of policy and not of rules. Entry under corporate name is more in accord with the purposes of the Project and the kind of use made of its catalog. For general libraries, however, we would recommend the use of corporate entries only in those cases in which a personal author is not given or is obviously unsuitable as an entry.

APPENDIX III

AUTHOR HEADINGS FOR STATE PUBLICATIONS⁴¹

Since 1939 the Division of Classification and Cataloging of the American Library Association has had a Special Committee on State Author Headings: "The work of the Committee has consisted chiefly in attempting to interest individuals and national or state groups of catalogers in the compilation of lists of headings."⁴² Many lists of state headings were begun, and several have been completed; during 1948 there appeared Miss A. Ethelyn Markley's *Author Headings for the Official Publications of the State of Alabama*. In the *Annual Report of the Special Committee on State Author Headings for 1947-48* it is stated that "the major accomplishment of the current year is the publication of the Alabama List. This is the first of the lists to be issued under A.L.A. sponsorship and, as such, will provide a model for all future lists."⁴³

The general A.L.A. rule for official publications covers state publications as well as the

⁴¹ The following discussion has been placed in appendix because, while important as indicating certain characteristics of present-day cataloging, it does not contribute directly to the development of the main theme of the paper.

⁴² A. E. Markley, *Author Headings for the Official Publications of the State of Alabama* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1948), p. vii.

⁴³ *A.L.A. Bulletin*, XLII (October, 1948), 443.

publications of other jurisdictions. Miss Markley quotes this rule in full in her Introduction, in the form taken from the final prepublication draft of 1947. Since this version differs in arrangement from that which we have quoted previously from the 1941 *Rules*, we will follow Miss Markley and reproduce the new version here, together with her comments:

In the matter of entering government publications A.L.A. *Cataloging Rules* (2d ed.) are clear and succinct. Careful study of them can leave little if any doubt in a cataloger's mind about the method of applying them. The guiding principles are set forth in General Rule No. 72 which states:

"Enter under countries, nations, states, cities, towns, and other government districts, official publications issued by them or by their authority.

"a) Enter publications from the various agencies of government under the names of the agencies (legislative bodies, courts, executive departments, bureaus, etc.) as subheadings (under country, or other jurisdiction) in the latest form in the vernacular. Refer from variant forms.

"1) Use for a subheading the name of the office rather than the title of the officer except where the title of the officer is the only name of the office. Make whenever necessary a reference from the name of the head of a department to the name of the office.

"Exception: Certain classes of institutions and other bodies created, maintained, controlled or owned by governments, but not direct agencies of

government, are, however, to be treated according to the rules governing these bodies as authors, e.g., colleges, universities, schools, libraries, museums, galleries, observatories, agricultural experiment stations, hospitals, asylums, prisons, theaters, chambers of commerce, botanical and zoological gardens, banks, business corporations, churches, societies, etc."⁴⁶

Miss Markley tells us further that "the rule is plain enough, but application to the particular body of material is not so simple because it is quite evident that in cataloging a collection of government publications or in compiling a list for an uncataloged collection, the successful use of this rule presupposes a knowledge of the names of the issuing offices."⁴⁷

Unfortunately, we must assert that this rule plus the knowledge of the names is not enough. The 1941 *Rules* contain another rule which, in part, contradicts Rule 72. Rule 154 tells us to "enter state and provincial institutions of the U.S. and Canada under the name of the state or province."

According to Rule 72, the following entries are correct: "Talladega, Ala. Institute for

Deaf and Blind"; "Auburn, Ala. Polytechnic Institute"; and "Birmingham, Ala. Business Industrial School." According to Rule 154, the above entries are wrong, and the following entries are correct: "Alabama. Institute for Deaf and Blind, Talladega"; "Alabama. Polytechnic Institute, Auburn"; and "Alabama. Business Industrial School, Birmingham."

Contradictions of this sort seem to us to be sufficient to discredit the 1941 *Rules*; but in this work on author headings, officially sponsored by the Division of Cataloging and Classification of the American Library Association, confusion is twice confounded. Nowhere in the volume is there even the vaguest hint of the existence of Rule 154. We are told, however, that the 1941 *Rules* are "clear and succinct"; that Rule 72 is "plain enough"; and that a careful study of the rules "can leave little, if any, doubt in a cataloger's mind about the method of applying them." A cataloger's mind must be wonderful indeed, because the author headings in this volume exhibit a complete disregard for Rule 72 and follow absolutely the contradictory Rule 154 which, as we have said, is nowhere mentioned in the whole volume. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

⁴⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. vii.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. viii.

THE OBLIGATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE LIBRARIAN CONCERNING CENSORSHIP¹

LEON CARNOVSKY

I HAVE never met a public librarian who approved of censorship or one who failed to practice it in some measure. In some cases the practice was resented and adopted only in response to assumed or actual pressure; in others, it was accepted as proper and was justified on the score that no library can provide all books and that, just as most books which have been published cannot be found in any single library, so a library is forced to practice censorship in effect, if not in name, by failing to acquire the thousands and millions of books which it passes up for reasons of money, space, community interest, or whatever cause.

First of all, I should like to clear up the confusion behind this conception; it is a confusion between book selection and censorship. Though the result may be the same in both—nonprovision of a book—the reasons are different and should be clearly recognized. Assume a typical public library in a middle western town of ten thousand, run by a librarian doing the best he can to provide a wide assortment of literature. The librarian sees a review of a history of Persian art, priced at \$25.00, but he quickly concludes that this book is not for him, a decision obviously based on sound reasoning. The elements in his reasoning are lack of potential interest, cost, possession of other books on the same general subject, and the relative importance to the accom-

plishment of his objectives of this book as compared with half-a-dozen others that he can buy for \$25.00. Then he sees an announcement in *Publishers' Weekly* of a new book by Faith Baldwin, but he has always felt that the literary standards of his collection required a better quality of fiction; therefore he does not even seriously consider the book, much less order it. Next he reads about a book entitled *Studs Lonigan*. It is well reviewed, widely publicized, inexpensive, and a lot of people ask for it. Yet the librarian decides not to buy it. Though all three books are thus denied the potential borrower, one would have to employ a highly specious logic to conclude that a censorship was operative in all three cases. We must clearly distinguish between identical effects that result from altogether different causes, and we shall never face the censorship problem squarely and honestly until we see that book selection (which implies book rejection) and censorship are not identical.

Censorship is defined in the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* as "the policy of restricting the public expression of ideas, opinions, conceptions and impulses which have or are believed to have the capacity to undermine the governing authority or the social and moral order which that authority considers itself bound to protect."² It is a conscious policy and may be enforced without the assent of the majority; indeed, it may be

¹ This paper was presented at the Fourth Annual Library Symposium, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, on May 13, 1949.

² *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, III (New York: Macmillan Co., 1930), 290.

instituted by a small group or even by an individual who feels strongly concerning a certain issue. Though such issues may fall in any sphere of human interest, the practice of censorship has been most frequently invoked in three areas, namely, politics, religion, and morals, and therefore it is in these areas that the problems of censorship as they impinge on library administration are most often encountered.

The theory of free speech in the political realm has been so thoroughly discussed that it seems a little strange that it should need a defense in 1949. Clearly and forthrightly expressed in the First Amendment to the Constitution, copied and incorporated in some form in our state constitutions, strongly supported by court decisions of the most respected and honored members of our judiciary, it still remains an ever present issue to plague and puzzle us. The reason is that freedom is not and can never be an absolute. My freedom to make noise is directly contrary to your freedom to enjoy quiet. Nor can there be absolute freedom of speech; society itself imposes limits upon it, and it becomes the business of the courts to determine whether the limits have been transgressed in individual cases.

Perhaps the clearest expression concerning free speech appears in our Bill of Rights: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press"; and the finest explication of the free-speech doctrine is to be found in John Stuart Mill's essay *On Liberty*. Little that has been written since adds much to his cogent argument. His primary object in writing his essay was to establish the principle that "the sole end for which mankind are warranted . . . in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection.

That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others."³ Included in the sphere of liberty of action is "the liberty of expressing and publishing opinions," even though such expression goes beyond strictly individual concern and extends to other persons. However, says Mill, since expression of thought is so closely allied to freedom of thought itself, it is practically inseparable from it.⁴

The champions of free speech, from Milton through Mill to Justice Holmes in our own day, have all been much more concerned with the preservation of the right of free speech for the individual—even though he be the only person in the nation who believes what he believes. Indeed, this is no more than the recognition of the fact that all progress in human affairs is possible only in an atmosphere which permits the unusual person, who is frequently the unpopular person, to get himself heard. The harm in silencing such a person is only incidentally the harm to him; the greater harm is to society, which may be thus deprived of the opportunity to learn a possible truth of which only he may be the master. The truth or wisdom of any issue, like the nature of the good and the beautiful, is never discerned by taking a vote; majorities as such have force on their side but little else. To silence a dissident is to solidify a position and thus to make less likely the possibility of change. Listen to Mill on this point:

The peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race: posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion still more

³ John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1921), pp. 12-13.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth; if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error.⁵

And again, with even greater force:

I insist thus emphatically on the importance of genius, and the necessity of allowing it to unfold itself freely both in thought and in practice, being well aware that no one will deny the position in theory, but knowing also that almost everyone, in reality, is totally indifferent to it. People think genius a fine thing if it enables a man to write an exciting poem, or paint a picture. But in its true sense, that of originality in thought and action, though no one says that it is not a thing to be admired, nearly all, at heart, think that they can do very well without it. . . . Originality is the one thing which unoriginal minds cannot feel the use of.⁶

This, however, is only one argument for free speech; others are equally cogent. Mill mentions three: first, a suppressed opinion, though false on the whole, may yet contain certain elements of truth. Accepted or "prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth; it is only by collision of adverse opinions that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied." Again, even in the unlikely event that on any given issue the opinion we hold is the complete truth, our confidence in it becomes more strongly intrenched as we see it in the light of lesser truths or even of false doctrines. And finally, says Mill, the meaning of the doctrine itself, if it is never challenged, may be lost and become a mere formal profession accepted from habit and not from conviction.⁷

Since the case for free speech is so solid in our historic tradition, in our constitutional guaranties, and in its logical persuasiveness, it seems odd that the principle is continually being challenged and has been fought several times all the way

up to the Supreme Court. And yet it is not so odd, for, as we have said, the concept of free speech is not an absolute, and it is continually necessary for the courts to determine where free speech may become a menace to society or even to the achievement of short-term goals which society, through its legislatures, may envisage. The single most important case involving free speech is the famous Schenck case, heard before the Supreme Court. Here the decision of the Supreme Court was written by Justice Holmes—not a dissent but presenting the unanimous opinion of the Court.

In June, 1917, and May, 1918, Congress enacted legislation aimed at controlling speech which might be construed as disloyal or seditious. The defendants, Schenck and his associates, had been found guilty in the lower courts of mailing circulars calculated to cause insubordination in the military forces; the circulars declared conscription to be despotism and urged the conscriptees to obstruct its operation. The defense invoked the free-speech clause of the Constitution, and it is this aspect that makes the case important for us. The statement of Justice Holmes in ruling on this point has been often quoted, because it laid down a rule that comes close to furnishing a yardstick, to drawing the line where the constitutional protection of free speech no longer applies. Said Holmes:

We admit that in many places and in ordinary times the defendants in saying all that was said in the circular would have been within their constitutional rights. But the character of every act depends upon the circumstances in which it is done. . . . The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theater and causing a panic. . . . The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 23. ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 90. ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

has a right to prevent. It is a question of proximity and degree. When a nation is at war many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight and that no court could regard them as protected by any constitutional right.⁸

The key phrase in this decision is "clear and present danger." The problem still remains to determine when a publication or an act constitutes a danger to the state or to society, but at least we have the right question, even if we cannot always provide the right answer. Indeed, even the Supreme Court was unable, in applying the test, to come out with a consistent answer. This is most clearly shown in the *Abrams* case, also decided in 1919, the year of the *Schenck* decision. *Abrams* and his associates had strewed some leaflets from the roof of a building in New York. These leaflets were not aimed at interfering with the war against Germany but protested against American intervention in the Russian Revolution. Included in the protest was a call for a general strike; this could be construed as interfering with the war against Germany, therefore the group was indicted. No strike was actually called, and there was no evidence that a single person had been moved to stop any kind of war work as a result of the leaflets. Nevertheless, the defendants were found guilty in the District Court, and the sentence imposed was upheld by a 7-2 vote of the Supreme Court. The great importance of this case for us lies in the dissenting opinion of Justice Holmes,⁹ concurred in by Justice Brandeis; in this opinion Holmes further develops the "clear and present danger" principle. He strikingly shows how strongly he has

been influenced by both Milton and Mill; his statement has been said to be the greatest utterance on intellectual freedom by an American and ranking with *The Areopagitica* and the essay *On Liberty*.¹⁰

Persecution for the expression of opinions seems to me perfectly logical. If you have no doubt of your premises or your power and want a certain result with all your heart you naturally express your wishes in law and sweep away all opposition. To allow opposition by speech seems to indicate that you think the speech impotent, as when a man says that he has squared the circle, or that you do not care wholeheartedly for the result, or that you doubt either your power or your premises. But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. Every year if not every day we have to wager our salvation upon some prophecy based upon imperfect knowledge. While that experiment is part of our system I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death, unless they so imminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law that an immediate check is required to save the country. . . . Only the emergency that makes it immediately dangerous to leave the correction of evil counsels to time warrants making any exception to the sweeping command, "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech."

I hope the implications for libraries of what I have said have not been lost. If there is one agency above all which has

⁸ *Schenck v. United States*, 249 United States Reports 47 (1919).

⁹ *Abrams v. United States*, 250 United States Reports 616, 624 (1919).

¹⁰ Max Lerner (ed.), *The Mind and Faith of Justice Holmes: His Speeches, Essays, Letters and Judicial Opinions* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1943), p. 306.

the power to put teeth into the principle of free speech, it is the public library. I know of no nobler function which it has to perform than this: the presenting of all points of view, however unpopular, even loathsome, some of them may seem; by the same token, I know of no greater evil, no surer betrayal of that function, than the denial of the expression of certain viewpoints through a deliberate or contrived censorship. This, you may say, is all very well in theory; does it really have any application today? Today the great competing political doctrines are, of course, democracy and communism. Within the framework of democracy itself there is room for dissension: the social welfare state versus an uncontrolled laissez faire, to name but one conflict. No library is likely to quibble over the presentation of these two points of view, or variations of them. The serious problem does arise over the presentation of the literature of communism. Here is material the publication of which is clearly sanctioned by the First Amendment; it is altogether legal by any test we may apply. The understanding of communism is as important as the understanding of democracy, capitalism, or the divine right of kings. No court, as far as I know, has ruled that the distribution of the literature of communism represents a "clear and present danger" to the security of our civilization.¹¹ It is clearly up to us to give the widest possible latitude to free speech within the political realm.

It is sometimes convenient to forget this principle in the face of certain pressures against a given position. An over-

¹¹ It is worth noting that in the recent trial of the eleven Communists in the U.S. District Court in New York, Judge Harold R. Medina included the following statement in his charge to the jury: "Books are not on trial here, nor are you concerned with the philosophical validity of any mere theories" (*New York Times*, October 14, 1949).

zealous American Legion post, a D.A.R. chapter, a religious or national group, or even an individual may feel so antagonistic toward another country or toward another faith or philosophy that it would deprive everyone else of the opportunity to read about them. They do not apply the "clear and present danger" principle; in fact, they apply no rational principle at all but act from a deeply felt emotion. Disagree with them, and you are labeled "un-American"—a strange transvaluation of values when a position espoused by the greatest American of our generation is called "un-American."

Numerous presentations in support of free speech might readily be cited; they are brilliantly summarized in a great dissenting opinion by Justice Brandeis, concurred in by Holmes. The case was that of *Pierce v. United States* and consisted of the prosecution of three Socialists for distributing a pamphlet denouncing war. Said Brandeis:

The fundamental right of free men to strive for better conditions through new legislation and new institutions will not be preserved if efforts to secure it by argument to fellow citizens may be construed as criminal incitement to disobey the existing law—merely, because the argument presented seems to those exercising judicial power to be unfair in its portrayal of existing evils, mistaken in its assumptions, unsound in reasoning or intemperate in language.¹²

We do well to remember with Chafee, the author of *Free Speech in the United States*, that the First Amendment was designed to protect two kinds of interest in free speech: the freedom of the individual to express himself and the freedom of society to listen, to weigh arguments, to balance claims. The boundary to free speech "is fixed close to the point where words will give rise to unlawful acts,"

¹² *Pierce v. United States*, 252 United States Reports 239 (1920).

and "the great interest in free speech should be sacrificed only when the interest in public safety is really imperiled, and not . . . when it is barely conceivable that it may be slightly affected."¹³ This is especially true in peacetime.

We next turn to free speech as it applies to religion, a subject on which we tend to be more sensitive than on any other. Criticism of one's most personal spiritual beliefs is bad manners at the least. It may become a serious nuisance, as it was when Jehovah's Witnesses hired loudspeakers to condemn publicly the members or tenets of other faiths. As a result many communities passed ordinances requiring licenses for the use of sound trucks. Jehovah's Witnesses, however, ignored this legislation and continued berating other creeds; they were arrested, prosecuted, and eventually appealed their case to the Supreme Court on the grounds that such licensing requirement constituted an abridgment of free speech. The Court, by a 5-4 vote, sustained the Witnesses, and the ordinance designed to curb the overexuberant preachings of this sect was declared unconstitutional.¹⁴ An even clearer case is that of *Lovell* (a Jehovah's Witness) v. *Griffin* (Ga.), where it was held by Justice Hughes, speaking for a unanimous Court, that an ordinance requiring written permission from the city manager for the distribution of literature of any kind was unconstitutional. "Whatever the motive which induced its adoption," said Hughes, "its character is such that it strikes at the very foundation of the freedom of the press by subjecting it to license and censorship."¹⁵ It should be

noted that free speech was the issue in both these cases, not criticism of religion. *This* issue was not even raised. Just as it is legally proper to criticize agnosticism, paganism, atheism, or any other negative form of religion, so it is proper to criticize its positive forms—Judaism, Catholicism, or any of the branches of Protestantism.

Interference with the right to criticize religions has been a serious library problem only sporadically in a few localities. Christian Scientists objected to Edward Dakin's biography of Mary Baker Eddy, published by Scribner's in the 1920's; and you are undoubtedly familiar with the strenuous objection raised in New York and a few other places to the *Nation's* series of articles by Paul Blanshard in which he criticized certain aspects of the Catholic church. In neither case did the issue reach the courts, for the right of publication guaranteed in the Constitution was too patent. Yet in both cases pressures were brought against libraries, and some censorship resulted. Censorship of the Blanshard articles in the *Nation* took a particularly serious form in New York, for not only were the issues containing the offensive articles removed from school-library shelves but subscriptions to the periodical were canceled at the direction of the superintendent of schools. We find here an implied threat against any periodical that may contemplate the publication of any article to which some powerful and numerous group might take exception.

It seems unnecessary to stress the library's responsibilities in this delicate area. The right to criticize religion must not be abrogated any more than the parallel right to criticize social or political beliefs. We plainly have the right to look critically at any religion, and members of a religious group lay themselves open to suspicion if they attempt to deny to any-

¹³ Zechariah Chafee, Jr., *Free Speech in the United States* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948), p. 35.

¹⁴ *Saia v. People of the State of New York*, 334 United States Reports 558 (1948).

¹⁵ *Lovell v. Griffin*, 303 United States Reports 444 (1938).

one this right. The answer to free speech is *more* free speech, not its obliteration. Serious discussion of the beliefs or operations of any established church is surely proper material for a public library.

In spite of the dangers of censorship of political and social ideas, it is in the area of morals that librarians have experienced the greatest difficulty, both from external interference and from the nature of the decision concerning the line between morality and immorality. Strictly speaking, it is not morality that introduces the problem but such concepts as obscenity, pornography, filth, or whatever other synonyms one prefers. Here too, as in political censorship, the First Amendment is invariably invoked by the publisher or author whose book is objected to. He may claim that the book is not obscene, or, less frequently, he may argue that the free-speech principle confers an unlimited right and that considerations of obscenity are irrelevant. However, we clearly have the right to legislate against the distribution of filth, and in one notable case, *United States v. Limehouse*, the Supreme Court upheld such a right. One Limehouse had written letters which the Court characterized as coarse, vulgar, disgusting, indecent, and unquestionably filthy within the popular meaning of that term.¹⁶ Does this type of thing create "a clear and present danger"? It would be difficult to prove this, yet Justice Brandeis took the position that Congress had the right to punish the distribution of filth.

It will be recognized that this was not the sort of "free speech" the Founding Fathers had in mind when drawing up the First Amendment. It has nothing to do with arriving at truth or rational decisions on the basis of conflicting ideas, of presenting evidence for a point of

view, or even of propagandizing for or against action construed in the public interest. The suppression of such speech harms no one but the individual suppressed. His right to be obscene is curbed in the interest of a larger right—that of the rest of us to be saved from his obscenities. Chafee has likened this to the curb we place on an individual to prevent his smoking in streetcars. The injury in both cases is immediate, in the discomfort caused the nonsmokers and in the shock to the sensitive listener and reader. Free speech does not include license or licentiousness; the "clear and present danger" test cannot here be invoked to draw the line between the permissible and the proscribed.¹⁷

This, however, is only the beginning and the simplest part of the problem. The major question remains that of an operational rather than of a dictionary definition of obscenity. This has turned out to be a matter of extraordinary difficulty, and it has been treated with little consistency from one court to another; frequently the decision seems to have been based on hunch or intuition—at any rate, without the spelling-out of a definition acceptable to other judges, to publishers, or to librarians. We speak glibly about ours being a nation governed by laws; but laws are not only made by men, they are also interpreted by men, and one man's interpretation is different from another's. Hence the vast number of dissenting opinions, in obscenity cases as well as in others.

Historically, American and British law has tended to rely on the definition provided by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, in 1868, in ruling against a pamphlet entitled *The Confessional Unmasked*: "I think the test of obscenity is this, wheth-

¹⁶ *United States v. Limehouse*, 285 United States Reports 424 (1932).

¹⁷ Zechariah Chafee, Jr., *Government and Mass Communications* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), I, 55-56.

er the tendency of the matter charged as obscenity is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences, and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall."¹⁸ By this definition we must determine for any one publication whether its effect is likely to be that envisaged by Judge Cockburn, and such decision is reserved to the courts. Usually, objection to certain books is raised by local police, perhaps at the instigation of private individuals or groups, and is disposed of by local courts. Federal courts have been involved far less frequently.

Lord Cockburn's formulation, continually cited as a guide, has recently been considered quite unsatisfactory because it goes much too far. It tacitly accepts as the boundary line the lowest common denominator of human intelligence. Any book might conceivably fall into the hands of a child or of a pathological adult who might thereby be corrupted. As Justice Qua, in the Massachusetts *Strange Fruit* case, observed: "A book placed in general circulation is not to be condemned merely because it might have an unfortunate effect upon some few members of the community who might be peculiarly susceptible."¹⁹ (Even so, Justice Qua joined the majority of the Massachusetts Supreme Court in upholding the right of the lower court to find the book obscene.)

In general, the recent tendency has been—outside Boston—to permit considerable latitude to the author, though most commentators agree that a line must be drawn somewhere. Liberal and intelligent commentators—like Chafee and Huntington Cairns, who as former

assistant general counsel to the Treasury Department was charged with ruling on literary importations—believe the line should be drawn at pornography, and on this point Cairns has written as follows:

Art . . . has its own morality, its own integrity, which those who would limit its treatment of sexual detail would do well to recognize. . . . We have to recognize, however, that this principle of justification covers only half, or less than half, the case. Not all writing is literature, not all information is science. There is . . . that class of material which is put forward with no other purpose in view than the stimulation of the sexual impulse. . . . In their bulk, these photographs and drawings, these miserably printed pamphlets and books, are as far removed from art as they could well be. . . . The principle which accords complete freedom to the artist and scientist in the treatment of sexual detail plainly does not justify pornography.²⁰

He then goes on to say: "There is no difficulty in distinguishing between those books the impulse behind which is literary and those whose impulse is pornographic. Any man with a modicum of literary knowledge can do so without hesitation." I wonder if Mr. Cairns would be quite so confident today. Consider the interesting case of Edmund Wilson's *Memoirs of Hecate County*. The book raised a storm of protest throughout the country, and the publisher, Doubleday, was brought before the New York Court of Special Sessions on the grounds of the book's alleged obscenity. Here it was judged obscene, with one justice dissenting. He held that the prosecution's interpretation of the law was "grossly inadequate," and he stated:

The writer of the story is evidently and honestly concerned with the complex influences of sex and of class consciousness and man's relentless search for happiness. That is a problem which also is of deep concern to the matured

¹⁸ *Regina v. Hicklin*, Law Reports, 3 Queen's Bench 360 at 371 (1868).

¹⁹ *Commonwealth v. Isenstadt*, 318 Massachusetts Reports at 551-54 (1945).

²⁰ Huntington Cairns, "Freedom of Expression in Literature," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CC (Philadelphia, 1938), 85.

reading public. That public is entitled to the benefit of the writer's insight and that right may not lightly be disregarded by excluding from consideration all interests but those of the young and immature.²¹

Nevertheless the book was held obscene, the judgment appealed successively to the Appellate Court, the Appeals Court, and the United States Supreme Court, and all upheld the ruling of the lower court. In the Supreme Court the vote was a 4-4 tie. Clearly the line between honest writing and obscenity is not easy to draw, even by persons with considerably more than Mr. Cairns's suggested "modicum of literary knowledge."

Perhaps the most widely publicized censorship case in recent years is that of James Joyce's *Ulysses*. This book, published abroad, was held up in customs on the charge of obscenity, and the case was heard before Judge Woolsey in the United States District Court. Judge Woolsey first raised the question of author's intent and concluded that the book was not written "for the purpose of exploiting obscenity." "I do not detect anywhere," he wrote, "the leer of the sensualist." But a second question arises: in spite of the author's sincerity, in spite of the book's quality, is it likely to harm the reader? Or, in line with the somewhat lurid language of the statute, did the book tend "to stir the sex impulses or to lead to sexually impure and lustful thoughts?" In short, what would be its effect upon the average man—*l'homme moyen sensuel*?

To answer this question, Judge Woolsey depended not only upon his own reading but also upon the opinions of two friends. Their conclusion was that the book did not tend to excite sexual impulses but instead served as "a somewhat tragic and very powerful commentary on the inner lives of men and women."

²¹ Justice Perlman's dissent.

Judge Woolsey said in his decision: "I am quite aware that owing to some of its scenes *Ulysses* is a rather strong draught to ask some sensitive, though normal, persons to take. But my considered opinion, after long reflection, is that, whilst in many places the effect of *Ulysses* on the reader undoubtedly is somewhat emetic, nowhere does it tend to be an aphrodisiac."²²

Three elements in this case are worth noting. The first is the consideration of the author's intent; the second, the possible effect on the reader; and the third, the method used to arrive at a decision—that of inviting others to join in judging the book. In a sense this method is the same as dependence on a jury but with this difference: that here the friends of the judge were selected deliberately for their ability to make a mature judgment on a difficult work of literary craftsmanship.

Thus far we have seen how the objection to obscene literature revolves around a question of definition, a definition not contained in the statutes enacted against obscenity but, rather, left to the courts. First, we have seen that in some instances pornography is readily identified and is beyond the protection of the First Amendment. Second, we have seen that the "clear and present danger" test is difficult to apply when the issue is obscenity. Who can say where the danger lies in being exposed to dirty language or unconventional situations? If we were to apply this test to literature, we might as well give up any attempt to bar filth. If a book is not obviously pornographic and if the "clear and present danger" test cannot be invoked, how shall the line be drawn? Here the answer has been the standards of the community, or, as

²² *United States v. One Book Called "Ulysses,"* 5 Federal Supplement 182 (N.Y., 1933).

Chafee suggests, how much frankness the community will stand.²³ This I frankly do not like; it seems to substitute one difficulty for another, without solving the basic problem. The "community" itself is difficult to define; is it a region, a city, or a neighborhood? Is it the majority of adults, and, if so, how do we know what they will accept? If we cannot depend on majorities, whose level shall be accepted as representing the community—that of a well-read minority or of a poorly read, superficial majority, or something in between? Under the circumstances, our best solution is probably the one Judge Woolsey hit upon: to rely upon the judgment of intelligent readers and to expect them to be as liberal as possible in making their decision. There is far less danger to the community, however defined, in permitting questionable literature to be published and read than there is in a strict definition of "obscenity" that would deny access to such literature. After all, what is the real objection? Are the censors afraid that we will be offended by books like *Studs Lonigan*? If there be any among us who would be offended, the solution is simple and readily at hand: we can close the book. Happily the freedom to read implies the freedom to desist from reading. But many of us will not desist, and that is what the censor truly fears: not that we will be offended but that we will be pleased.²⁴

Where does this leave the library? Shall the library provide books which some courts—notably in Massachusetts

—have ruled obscene? Shall it consider as unacceptable books that have actually been cleared by the courts? And what about the large mass of books that never come to the courts at all? In fact, it is this group that may cause the library the most heart-searching and even embarrassment. The library cannot wait for a test case to be brought to trial, yet it must make its decision shortly after publication. My answer would be that in the first case, where the courts have ruled a book obscene, it all depends on which court. If it is a state or municipal court, we need take its ruling seriously *only* when our library is within the jurisdiction of the ordinance on which the court acts. There is no reason for a library in Ohio to remove *Strange Fruit* from its collection merely because a Massachusetts court considered it obscene. In the second case, where a book has been cleared by the courts, that is a point in its favor, although there may be other good and sufficient reasons why it may be rejected by the library. A book should have more to commend it than the mere absence of dirt before it is judged legitimate library bookstock.

As for the third case, where we cannot look to the courts for guidance, I believe we must depend on some such test as that which Judge Woolsey applied. Here the librarian himself must be the judge, and he should apply his best efforts toward determining whether the book in question, taken as a whole, is to be considered obscene. In making his decision he should give the benefit of the doubt to the book. Presumably, it is not "dirt for dirt's sake"; like most books, it is not likely to lead the reader to sexual excesses or immorality; it is not likely to give offense to the normal reader because of its language or frank descriptions. If the librarian, like Judge Woolsey, wishes

²³ Chafee, *Government and Mass Communications*, I, 215.

²⁴ "The objection which the Watch and Ward Society makes to many of the books it wishes to suppress is not that these books offend readers but that they delight them. . . . The true fear of the censor is that the ideas set forth will in the long run undermine our present system of marriage and morality" (*ibid.*, p. 57).

to check his judgment against that of others, he may call on literate citizens at large, whose judgment he trusts, for an opinion. They too should be very slow to rule against a book, and in judging its possible effect on the library's readers they should certainly not take as the norm the adolescent or immature adult, nor should they give undue weight to the probability that the book will offend some people. Most important of all, they should never lose sight of the fact of which Chafee reminds us, "that stamping on a fire often spreads the sparks, that many past suppressions are now considered ridiculous, that the communication of ideas is just as important in this field as in any other, and that healthy human minds have a strong natural resistance to emotional poisons."²⁵ Remember that Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* was at one time considered unfit to be read; remember, too, that books like *The Naked and the Dead* and *The Young Lions* would probably not have found a publisher twenty years ago but are today listed among the notable books of 1948.

Yet even with all these precautions some people will protest. They may be a church group, a superpatriotic society, or even one or two individuals. The protest may be lodged against books in the political or social realm or against a novel. It may take the form of mere objection, or it may become an ugly threat against the library or its librarian. Even more important, perhaps, is the fear of such objection, a fear that, oftener than we think, may lead a librarian or library board to rule out certain books to avoid an embarrassing situation which *may* develop—in short, to deprive the potential and interested reader rather than take a chance on someone's objection. Such objection is

thought to create bad public relations, though we should remember that equally bad public relations may develop by failing to provide certain books.

Let us analyze this situation for a moment, taking the matter of a potential objection first. We might as well recognize that this is an ever present possibility; we can never escape the chance that someone may feel unhappy about a particular book. Yet I think that in an overwhelming number of cases, where a library has actually obtained the book, no protest developed at all. Fear of protest usually turns out to be a straw man. But suppose that a protest is lodged: should it be taken seriously enough to withdraw the book? We must consider the nature of the book and the nature of the protestant. If the book was seriously weighed in the light of its quality and of library policy and was acquired because it met the standards imposed by the library, I see no reason for its withdrawal. As for the protestant, does he represent a sufficiently numerous citizenry, or is he speaking solely for himself or for a special group? Even if the librarian were to decide on the basis of numbers, why should he assume that more people would object to the book than would welcome it or would at least be indifferent to its provision?

We hear a great deal these days about the need to protect minorities, particularly their right to free speech and assembly. But in protecting minority rights we must be careful to distinguish between the right to express and the right to dominate. Majorities also have their rights: no minority should abuse its privilege so as to shackle the majority. What "right" permits any minority—racial, national, or religious—tacitly to say to the rest of the community: "You shall not read this book"? In assuring minori-

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

ties their right to self-expression, their right to object, let us not extend to them the privilege of dictating to the rest of us what we may or may not read. As the philosopher F. H. Bradley has written: "What is not tolerable is that stunted natures should set up their defects as a standard. It is an outrage, it is sheer blasphemy, when they bring the divine creations of literature and art to the touchstone of their own impotence, their

own animalism, and their own immorality."²⁶

Censorship is an evil thing. In accepting it, in compromising, in "playing it safe," the librarian is false to the highest obligations of his profession. In resisting it, he retains his self-respect, he takes his stand with the great champions of free speech, and he reaffirms his fundamental faith in the dignity of man.

²⁶ Quoted in Cairns, *op. cit.*

AUSTRIAN LIBRARIES, PAST AND PRESENT

JOSEF STUMMVOLL

AUSTRIA, although today a small country, has contributed greatly to the culture of Europe. The remarkable thing about Austrian cultural life is that its foundations are international rather than purely national—a fact stressed by President Karl Renner in an article written for the American quarterly *Foreign Affairs*:

There was a period when Spanish was the court language. For a time, the Earldom of Burgundy and the Austrian Netherlands were part of Austria, and then the language of the court was predominantly French. The masterpieces of the Netherlands painters today enrich the Vienna Art History Museum with untold splendors. The greater part of present Italy belonged to the Hapsburgs; Italian architecture immortalized itself everywhere in Austria, and the masters of Italian music were supreme there until Gluck, Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven displaced them. In the government, the army and in the schools Frenchmen, Netherlands, Italians and Germans mingled with the natives. The aristocracy of all nations flocked to Vienna, and even today many of the aristocratic houses of Austria bear Spanish, Italian, Netherlands and French names.¹

A similar international pattern is reflected in the history of Austrian libraries. As in most other European countries, their gradual development has been from the monastic library of the Middle Ages to the university and town library; thence, during the nineteenth century, to the provincial, administrative, and institute library; and, finally, to the public library. Private libraries have, of course, always existed.

More than anywhere else in Europe,

¹ *Foreign Affairs*, XXVI, No. 3, 590.

the monastic library may still be found in Austria. There are today more than sixty important such libraries (besides a number of lesser ones) which hold valuable, often unique, treasures of manuscripts, incunabula, and early prints. Among the twenty orders that own such monastic collections, the Benedictines, the Cistercians, and the Austin Friars are the most prominent. Centers of spiritual life in the Middle Ages, they mark the beginning of a general cultural life in Austria. St. Peter in Salzburg, founded in the sixth century, Kremsmünster (founded A.D. 777), and the eleventh-century monasteries of St. Florian, Admont, Goettweig, Melk, and Klosterneuburg all contain treasures for the bibliophile. The twelfth century marks the foundation of Heiligenkreuz, Seitenstetten, the Viennese Schottenstift, Lilienfeld, Vorau, Zwettl, and St. Paul.

In the eighteenth century monastic libraries suffered a considerable decline with the closing by Emperor Joseph II of about one hundred monasteries in the territory of present-day Austria. Their treasures were taken to the main libraries of the individual provinces; the most valuable items for the most part went to the Hofbibliothek (Imperial Library).

The University of Vienna (founded in 1365) at first had only faculty libraries and several Bursenbibliotheken (college libraries); they were combined, in 1545, to form the first Austrian university library. In 1756, however, this library's holdings were consolidated, for want of space, with those of the Imperial Li-

brary, which was already open to certain classes of readers and, at that time, owned more than two hundred thousand books.

The first Viennese town library came into existence as early as 1466; it was incorporated into the Hofbibliothek in 1780.

The Hofbibliothek was perhaps the first private library in any country to gain outstanding importance. Founded in 1526, its actual beginnings go back even further. Research is under way which may trace its origins to the beginning of the fourteenth century. It should be remembered that the Hofbibliothek belonged not alone to the Habsburg Dynasty but for three centuries was the library of the German emperors. This explains the presence in the library of many books which were presented by publishers who were selling their wares at the Frankfurt Fair.² It further accounts for the rich holdings of books from Spain, northern Italy, and Belgium. After 1808 the Hofbibliothek became the recipient of so-called *Pflichtexemplare* (copyright deposits) of all books published in Austria and Hungary. Hungary was released from this obligation in 1867, whereas the delivery of copyright deposits from the rest of Austria was regulated by the press laws of 1867 and 1922.

With the growth of national power during the eighteenth century came the establishment of a general state library organization. Between 1745 and 1767 Empress Maria Theresa, chiefly with the holdings of the closed-down Jesuit monasteries, founded the university libraries of Innsbruck and Graz as well as the

Studienbibliotheken³ of Linz and Klagenfurt and in 1777 re-established the university library of Vienna.

Among university libraries Austria has two polytechnical libraries (Vienna and Graz) and one library each for the fields of agriculture, economics, music (all in Vienna), and mining (Leoben). The Academy of Science also has a richly endowed collection. From among the many libraries of learned societies, scientific institutions, archives, and museums should be mentioned those of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde (Society of the Friends of Music), well stocked with autographs of famous musicians; the Kunstgewerbemuseum (Museum of Arts and Crafts), the Kunsthistorische Museum (art); the Naturhistorische Museum (natural sciences); and the Museum für Volkskunde (folklore). Moreover, Austria is rich in administrative libraries; ever since, by a decree of 1937, their direction was restricted to librarians with the Doctors' degree, these libraries have shown a marked improvement and have become indispensable for commercial and clerical work.

Mention should be made also of the libraries of certain industrial enterprises; of libraries in schools and other educational establishments; of the numerous youth and public libraries; and of the well-endowed Pädagogische Zentralbibliothek (Central Pedagogical Library) in Vienna. Among municipal libraries Vienna alone has forty-six branches with total holdings of 205,000 volumes, eighty-five full-time workers, and many part-time assistants. In addition, there are a great many community and parish libraries, socialist and workers' libraries, as well as

² Publishers purchased a "Privilegium" from the German emperors; this prevented reprints of their books by other publishers. Possessors of the "Privilegium" deposited copies of their books in the Imperial Library.

³ "Studienbibliothek" is the term applied to a government-owned library in the metropolis of a federal province without a university.

a number of well-endowed collections for the blind and the deaf.

The earliest private libraries were, for the most part, absorbed by the Hofbibliothek. Of later collections owned by Austrian aristocrats, the most prominent are the world-famous Liechtenstein-Fideikommiss library; the libraries of Counts Harrach, Seilern, and Lanckoronski; the Rosthorn Sinological library; the Portheim and Redlich collections in Vienna; the libraries of Count Wilczek at the castles of Kreuzenstein and Seebarn; the library of Count Falkenstein at Lamberg; the Prince Parma collection at Schwarzhau; and the Duke of Cumberland Fideikommiss library at Gmunden. It is as yet difficult to ascertain the present condition of these collections.

The establishment, in 1848, of a separate Austrian Ministry of Education marked the beginning of a new era for librarianship. The newly founded ministry immediately took over six university libraries (Vienna, Graz, Innsbruck, Prague, Cracow, Lemberg) and six Studienbibliotheken (Salzburg, Linz, Klagenfurt, Laibach, Goerz, Olmütz). To these twelve libraries was added, in 1875, that of the University of Czernowitz. All of them were open to the public and served not only their respective universities but the higher imperial and royal institutions as well. In addition to their educational functions, they occupied the rank of "provincial libraries," with the right to copyright deposit as conferred upon such institutions by the decrees of 1807 and 1815. Their holdings of printed books, incunabula, and manuscripts were considerable for the time and testify to the high cultural level of Austria in those days. In 1860 total holdings of printed works in the six university libraries amounted to 534,384 volumes, of which 159,644 were in Vienna. By comparison,

Harvard, in 1850, held 70,000 volumes, the Library of Congress, in 1851, 57,000 volumes.

As the demand for new libraries grew, the newly established Ministries of Education, Finance, Justice, the Imperial Household and Foreign Affairs, War, and Commerce founded administrative libraries of their own, using the dissolved collections of their predecessors, each ministry having complete jurisdiction over its own library. When, in 1937, the requirements for research librarians were standardized by special decree—stipulating, among other things, that librarians must have the Doctor's degree—all ministerial libraries came under the authority of the Ministry of Education. This decree (which established what is known as the *Concretualstatus*) climaxed a long and gradual trend toward central control by the Ministry of Education. Thus the libraries of the Bergakademie (Mining Academy) at Leoben and the Geologische Reichsanstalt (Geological Academy) in Vienna, both founded in 1849, had been under its jurisdiction ever since their inception, as well as those of the Hochschule für Bodenkultur (Academy for Agriculture), founded in 1872, and of the Music Academy, established in 1919. Others, originally independent, came under the control of the Ministry of Education sooner or later. For example, the library of the Academy of Technical Sciences at Graz was placed under its supervision in 1888 and that of the Hochschule für Welthandel (Academy for World Trade) in 1919. The Technisch-gewerbliche Zentralbücherei (Central Technical Library) and that of the Ministry of Social Welfare were taken over as a result of the establishment of the *Concretualstatus*.

In 1920, with the nationalization of the Hofbibliothek and its seven special

departments, the Ministry of Education received its most significant addition in library holdings and personnel. At the time, the Department of Printed Books alone held over a million volumes; the manuscript department owned 33,000 German, Latin, Greek, and oriental manuscripts, 7,000 incunabula, and 35,000 autographs; the music department, 12,000 manuscripts and 17,000 volumes of printed music; the map collection, 55,000 maps, bound and unbound; the papyrus department, 81,000 Greek, Latin, and oriental papyri, papers, and ostraca; the portrait department, 110,000 portraits; and the collection of engravings, 350,000 engravings, etchings, and woodcuts.

Of great importance for the development of Austrian libraries was the establishment, in 1909, of the office of a counselor for library matters within the Ministry of Education. Since the early part of the century the need for such a specialist, i.e., an active librarian to manage library matters in the ministry, had repeatedly been stressed, particularly by the Austrian Library Association. The counselor's part in policy-making decisions of the Ministry of Education grew more influential with time and culminated in the appointment, on May 27, 1948, of the then director of the Austrian National Library, Dr. Josef Bick, to the post of inspector-general of Austrian libraries.

The professional education of library personnel was regulated—and the standards of librarianship noticeably improved—by the introduction, in July, 1929, of certain prerequisites and separate compulsory examinations for technical and research librarians, without which state employment could thenceforth not be obtained. There are today 96 research librarians (12 of them women) and 79 technical librarians (of whom two-thirds

are women) under the control of the inspector-general. Though these figures may appear small, it must be remembered that, in proportion to the total population, this would correspond to about 2,000 research and 1,750 technical librarians in the United States.

The Vienna Universitätsbibliothek was the first Austrian library to begin work, in 1850, on a volume catalog of its holdings. It comprised twenty-two volumes and was revised and reissued in 1901. Other large libraries had followed suit in establishing card and volume catalogs of their own. The planning of subject catalogs, on the other hand, was a comparatively late and slow process and became the object of heated controversy. The National Library, in 1924, published instructions for its alphabetical subject catalog;⁴ in 1928, to illustrate their practical application, it issued an alphabetical subject catalog of its holdings in German language and literature.⁵ Among the most notable of Austrian catalogs was the *Generalkatalog der laufenden periodischen Druckschriften* ("General Catalog of Current Periodical Publications"), the first to list a considerable part of the holdings of all university, Studien-, and technical libraries, as well as of a number of academies; a supplement to this catalog gives the additional holdings of the Nationalbibliothek. The *Generalkatalog* formed the basis for a policy of systematic acquisitions of periodicals in Austria and was an important forerunner of the subsequent *Gesamtwachstumsverzeichnis der Bibliotheken Österreichs* ("Complete List of Publications Acquired by Austrian Libraries").

⁴ *Vorschriften für den Schlagwortkatalog der Nationalbibliothek.*

⁵ *Schlagwortkatalog über die Bestände der Nationalbibliothek auf dem Gebiete der deutschen Sprache und Literaturgeschichte.*

The quarterly *Zuwachsverzeichnis der Druckschriften der Nationalbibliothek* ("List of Acquisitions of Printed Material of the National Library"), with its supplement, the *Zuwachs der Spezialsammlungen der Nationalbibliothek* ("Acquisitions of the Special Libraries of the National Library"), was published from 1923 until 1930. In 1931 this became the *Österreichische Gesamtzuwachsverzeichnis*, a work in which thirty-two libraries co-operated. Such organized collaboration would previously have been impossible for lack of uniform cataloging rules, a difficulty that had become apparent during the compiling of the above-mentioned "General Catalog of Current Periodical Publications." In 1929 efforts were begun to expand the *Gesamtkatalog der preussischen Bibliotheken* into a general German-language catalog through collaboration of all German states and Austria. Since publication of the Prussian catalog had already been started, all participating countries of necessity had to adopt Prussian cataloging procedures. This was confirmed for Austria by a decree of the Austrian Ministry of Education issued January 1, 1930. Beginning in 1936, one hundred of the major German and Austrian libraries, with total holdings of thirty-five million volumes, collaborated on the German-language catalog, a project which, unfortunately, fell victim to World War II.

Scores of useful catalogs, too numerous to list individually, aided greatly in the development of Austrian libraries and rendered their holdings accessible to the general reader. In cases where even the practiced visitor to the library cannot trace a book with the aid of available catalogs, he can consult the *Büchernachweisstelle der österreichischen Bibliotheken* (Book Location Center of Austrian Libraries), established in the Nationalbibliothek in 1920, which periodically

sends check lists to all Austrian libraries.

The problem of space, while always a pressing one, is now more acute than ever before. The tendency in the past was to house university and academy libraries in the main buildings of their institutions. This turns out to have been a grave mistake, since the allotted space has been fully exhausted and temporary provisions for the ever increasing holdings are proving inadequate. Most seriously affected in this respect is the university library of Vienna, which lost some of its former space in air raids during the war. Here the erection of a new building in the vicinity of the university has become imperative. For the Nationalbibliothek, severely handicapped by lack of space ever since its nationalization, plans have been under discussion since 1926 for the construction of a large central library in Vienna based on the most modern principles. Lack of funds has prevented the realization of these plans.

Damage to libraries and library holdings as a result of World War II has been severe. Many collections had been removed early in the war from the larger towns and cities to more remote spots that were believed safe from the danger of air raids. As it was, many of these hiding places, especially in eastern Austria, became military bases and theaters of war, whereas the subterranean shelters of Vienna turned out to provide adequate protection for books stored in them. In a few Viennese libraries, where holdings had not been removed in time, the books actually remained intact in their usual stacks above ground. In the Central Technical Library in Vienna a bomb exploded in the midst of thirty-five thousand volumes waiting to be transferred, causing the destruction of only one thousand to fifteen hundred volumes.

Many of the collections that had been evacuated to supposedly safe storage

places suffered heavy losses; some were destroyed along with their hiding places, others by fire or through storage in damp caves. Restoration of otherwise unharmed collections proved to be a slow process for lack of trucks and carriers and was not completed until late in 1946. The safest shelters turned out to be the mines in the Salzkammergut to which the Nationalbibliothek had transferred its holdings, those at Hallein which harbored the treasures of St. Peter of Salzburg, the vaults beneath the Vienna Hofburg, the church of Laimgruben, and the New Town Hall. Most seriously affected were the collections of the Vienna University and Municipal libraries, of the Patent Office, and of the Geologische Bundesanstalt (Federal Geological Institute).

On the whole, damages to library buildings were less serious than were losses in books, and nearly all were caused by air raids. The only separate library building, that of the Nationalbibliothek, did not suffer at all. Of those that were merely wings of public buildings set aside for use as libraries, many were hit and seriously damaged, among them the rooms of the music and papyrus collection in the Albertina, the top floor of the Vienna University Library, parts of the library of the Museum of Arts and Crafts, the Central Technical Library, the library of the Federal Geological Institute, and the main stacks of the Municipal Library in the New Town Hall. The library of the Ministry of War was destroyed by fire, as were the catalogs of the State Railways Library and the reading-rooms of the Zentralbibliothek. Outside of Vienna, the town library of Wiener-Neustadt was completely destroyed by bombs, and the library of the Wilten monastery near Innsbruck was heavily damaged.

One of the by-products of war that

caused considerable loss to Austrian holdings was the looting of libraries by Nazi authorities. The 160,000-volume social science collection of the Arbeiterkammer (Workers' Chamber) was confiscated in its entirety and deposited in four southern Bohemian castles from which it is hoped it may yet be retrieved. The rest of the workers' libraries in Vienna lost about 60 per cent of their holdings in book raids organized by the Nazis. Viennese organization and association libraries—such as the Catholic Library Circle, the Public Reading Hall, the library of the Popular Education Association, and the various parish libraries—were dissolved in 1939 and their holdings taken over by the Municipal Library. Ninety per cent of the confiscated stocks are believed to have been destroyed. The Zentralbibliothek alone lost 100,000 volumes by Nazi confiscation.

Monastic and public libraries also suffered through Nazi suppression and wartime destruction; most severely affected were the monasteries of Altenburg, Goettweig, St. Paul of Carinthia, Admont, Rain, Wilten, and Stams.

Apart from some that were totally destroyed—and most of these were small public libraries—approximately 12 per cent of the sixty-odd library buildings about which the report was made were badly damaged. Nearly all of them, however, had previously evacuated their holdings. Although a correct estimate is not yet possible, it may be assumed that about 28 per cent of the libraries suffered heavy losses to their collections, while damages to 45 per cent were relatively slight. Exact figures on damages to public, monastic, and private libraries are not yet available; the state libraries of Austria, however, still possess more than thirteen million items.

PUBLIC LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT IN BELGIUM¹

LEO SCHEVENHEL

IN ORDER to understand the present condition of public libraries in Belgium, one must bear in mind a number of factors: (1) the bilingual nature of the country: five million inhabitants in the northern part of the country speak Dutch, whereas for the three and a half million in the south of Belgium, French is the native tongue; (2) the political friction and sharp religious differences; (3) the economic structure of the country: the south is industrial, the north predominantly agrarian. Only in the past few decades has the Flemish province of Limburg moved to the fore as an economic factor.

All this bears witness to a profound dualism which has hampered the development of the public library in Belgium. Not only does it imply different mentalities and contradictory beliefs, but it leads, above all, to a dissipation of energies and to the inefficient utilization of what little money is available. Here, then, is the reason why—with but one exception—it has not been possible to create public libraries in the true sense of the word, though a number of institutions are commonly referred to by that term.

In the course of the nineteenth century Belgians became as aware as the rest of the Western world of every man's right to intellectual development. This awareness led directly to the founding of schools and of popular libraries. Wherever education improved only gradually and had to rely on public aid, the organi-

zation of the libraries remained a secondary objective. Furthermore, the popular libraries, such as they were, aimed only at providing reading matter on an inferior level. As a result of the obvious lack of interest in administrative circles, the founding and maintenance of libraries came to depend more and more on private initiative.

Naturally, the existing class distinctions brought with them a sharp differentiation among the so-called "public" libraries; at Ghent, in 1838, it was planned to build a "select library" (for the bourgeoisie) next to a "popular library" (for the working class). Furthermore, the libraries were in danger of being considered philanthropic institutions. The majority of the popular libraries degenerated more and more into instruments of political power, subordinated to the machinations of the different political parties. To a certain degree this is the situation even today, which explains why some communities of a few thousand population own as many as three or four popular libraries.

The duality of language and ideology, with its resulting rivalries, added to the chaos. The second half of the nineteenth century saw the birth of three organizations that included in their platform the founding of popular and itinerant libraries. The *Ligue de l'Enseignement* ("league for education"), limited to the French-speaking part of the country, in 1864 became the linguistic counterpart of the Flemish *Willemsfonds* (1851) and *Davidfonds* (1875). The two latter organizations, in turn, were divided by an

¹ Trans. Sibylle Crane.

ideological antagonism—the Willemsfonds being essentially liberal, the Davidsfonds Catholic, in orientation—which led to a heated controversy, culminating, at the end of the century, in a violent school struggle.

The social and pedagogical activity of the libraries was bound to suffer by such controversies. Again, wherever the public library movement was not caught in the conflict of ideas, it was severely handicapped by inadequate financial support. Such, then, was the situation in Belgium at the turn of the century, while other countries were passing the kind of legislation that Belgians are today still awaiting.

Inadequately equipped as they were, the libraries had to withstand, during World War I, an unprecedented popular demand for reading matter. In this connection, credit should be given to the *Comiteit der werken voor volkslectuur*, which came to the rescue, in 1915, with its installation of 950 itinerant libraries.

The postwar period, in the course of its efforts for national reconstruction, brought the realization of such social goals as the eight-hour day and the institution of compulsory schooling up to the age of fourteen. The libraries formed a logical part of these efforts toward improvement, and in 1921 the *Destrée Act* was passed.² The opportunity it present-

ed for an entirely new policy was, however, neglected; its authors not only failed to take account of developments abroad but committed the structural error of perpetuating the nineteenth-century type of popular library. The only thing they copied from other countries was the name: the popular library became the public library; but no one realized that this well-intentioned title could not compensate for the basic weaknesses of the system.

At least one positive result was, however, achieved: the indorsement of the book by the state. Unfortunately, this fact did not make up for the shortcomings of the *Destrée Act*. The law, to begin with, was aimed at a minimum far below the needs of a working library, allowing not even for the most basically essential book purchases of any public library. Nor did the drafters take into account the varying functions of the different libraries: thus the popular library in a city of 150,000, such as Liège, would receive approximately the same subsidy as a community of 5,000. Moreover, the authors of the law entertained the mistaken belief that the political and ideological divergences would only assure

to everybody; (d) are free except for a small charge on home loans; (e) have at least one (two-hour) lending session in localities of up to 3,000 population, two in towns of from 3,000 to 20,000 inhabitants, and three in all others; (f) submit to state inspection; and (g) are managed by certified librarians of Belgian nationality.

² The *Destrée Act* provides for three types of "public" library that may be recognized by the state: (1) libraries organized and administered by the communities, (2) libraries taken over by the communities, (3) free libraries organized and administered by individuals. The communities may create or adopt one or several libraries, according to their needs, each community spending at least Fr. 1.50 (about 3-4¢) per capita of its population for the management, maintenance, and development of the library.

These "public" libraries qualify for state aid and subsidies if they (a) are conveniently located; (b) possess a certain minimum number of books and maintain a minimum circulation; (c) are accessible

Every year the state organizes courses of from thirty to forty hours to prepare the candidates for the qualifying examination. The librarian's annual salary is Fr. 1,500.00 (for one lending session), Fr. 3,000.00 (for two sessions), or Fr. 4,500.00 (for three), which corresponds to about \$33.00, \$66.00, or \$99.00, respectively, per year. The government, through gifts of books and periodicals as well as financial subsidies, encourages libraries recognized as "public"; in 1947, for example, Fr. 5,397,560.00, or about \$120,000.00, were spent on the 2,311 recognized libraries, a sum which included the salaries of the librarians.

the vitality of a general culture. Another serious error was to leave the various communities free to decide whether or not they wished to found or adopt popular libraries, a privilege which failed to rouse the local authorities to their responsibility in regard to the public library. And, finally, the public library, even under the new act, was still regarded as essentially a philanthropic institution.

Hence, the condition of the libraries in Belgium continues to be an unhealthy one. Certain groups, to be sure, have worked diligently since 1921 for the installation of genuine public libraries as vital mediums of culture. The most notable among these groups are the *Vlaamse Vereniging van Bibliothecarissen* (1921) and, on a lesser scale, the *Algemeen Verbond der Katholieke Boekerijen* (1922) and the *Centrale voor Arbeidersopvoeding* (1930). Moreover, a number of librarians—particularly those who had traveled abroad and a few who were well-read in library science and aware, therefore, of developments in other countries—realized the need for a change. The convincing arguments of a handful of fellow-librarians with progressive ideas, together with the lessons learned from practical experience, could not fail to exert a positive influence. This spiritual enlightenment, however, has not as yet produced all the desired practical results, the chief reasons for which are as follows: (1) the official authorities are generally apathetic; (2) most of the librarians of the scholarly libraries have not lent the necessary support; (3) government officials are uninformed of the condition and organization of public libraries abroad (this might explain, for example, their considering at present the establishment of bookmobile circuits without the necessary nuclei of central libraries); (4) the

various political parties whom the local administrators represent are doing everything in their power to retain the library as a political instrument.

Let us summarize the situation as it appears today:

On the credit side, mention must be made of (1) the fact that there are 2,500 so-called "public libraries"; (2) the existence, in a few cities and large communities, of a handful of libraries that are "public" in the true sense of the word, as, for example, those at Antwerp (the oldest and most important), Liège, Ghent, Hoboken, Ostend, Malines, Namur, and several more; (3) the promising results obtained in some of the provinces, as in the industrial sections of Liège and Hainaut, which are concentrating on the development of itinerant libraries, and in Antwerp and—more recently—Limburg where efforts have been directed primarily toward the central libraries and the improvement of their technical collections; (4) the *Stella Maris* sailors' library at Antwerp and a library for the fishermen of Ostend; (5) the existence of five training schools for librarians which are turning out competent personnel for future public libraries: two at Antwerp (one of them Catholic), two in Brussels, and one at Liège.

On the debit side, however, one must list (1) the fact that the library problem is intimately linked to the needs of education in general: thus, specialists in the professions cannot, in the majority of libraries, find even the basic essentials for further improvement in their particular fields, and students in the fields of technical and secondary-school education find the libraries equally inadequate study centers; (2) the libraries are incapable of fulfilling their social and educational functions; theirs is a struggle for survival which precludes the enlarge-

ment of their book stocks; (3) the great disparity in library service throughout the country: Brussels, for example, with a population of 187,576 according to a 1946 census, does not have what could properly be termed a "public library"; (4) the pervasive influence of political infiltration; (5) the complete lack of reading-rooms with magazines and reference works; (6) the absence of any buildings specifically designed to harbor collections (although, as early as 1941, there were complete plans for the construction of at least three such buildings); (7) the need for however tenuous a co-operative relationship among the individual libraries and between them and the scientific institutions.

What, then, may one expect of the immediate future?

The first task must be to organize, in addition to the popular libraries, genuine *public* libraries in all towns and communities—one library to every community—to serve as the basis for a future public library system. The example of other countries should furnish an incentive; what has been accomplished by such small nations as Holland and Denmark ought certainly to be feasible in Belgium.

Since 1945 a law has been under consideration which would provide for approximately eighty public libraries com-

parable to those of England and America. The passage of that law would mean the erection of library buildings with reading-rooms housing magazines and extensive reference collections, the establishment of children's libraries with the necessary reading-room facilities, the complete separation of libraries from political machinations, possibilities for extension work, the development of an indigenous library-science literature, and the emergence of the profession of "public librarian" as a new cultural function.

Once these primary objectives have been attained, the next would be the formation of regional libraries designed to serve communities hitherto inadequately equipped and the introduction of the bookmobile for the more sparsely settled regions. The final step would be the establishment of a national central library.

If it were possible, ultimately, to achieve the kind of interrelation between public libraries and the special and scientific collections that would guarantee maximum utilization of the latter, one would indeed have arrived at the ideal situation of having made available any book to any reader. Only then will the public library be fulfilling its function in the social and intellectual life of the nation and, beyond that, in the interest of international understanding.

THE COVER DESIGN

LAURENTIUS DE RUBEIS came from Valenza, a small town on the River Po a little north of Alessandria, to Ferrara, where he opened up a book-selling and paper-jobbing business. He also formed a partnership to engage in printing, and, on October 5, 1482, his firm completed its only book, Averroes' *Coliget*, which was published in two issues. One issue gives Ferrara in the colophon as the place of publication, the other Venice (where undoubtedly part of the edition was sold).

Rubeis evidently found this first attempt at printing unrewarding, for there were no productions from his press until late in 1489. At that time he issued a few books of popular piety and theology; then, about May, 1490, he again stopped printing.

Two years later, he took as a partner Andreas de Grassis and with him completed a book in September, 1492. Apparently, either Grassis or a newly acquired patron of the firm was interested in medicine, for the three editions which they printed were all of medical works. In 1493 the press once more suspended operations.

In 1496 Rubeis resumed printing. This time he appears to have had the backing of a wealthy patron, for he acquired an excellent collection of woodcuts to ornament and illustrate his books. Theology became once more the staple of his press, and he continued to print in Ferrara until 1501.

He then migrated briefly and introduced printing into the town of Sermede. There, in

December, 1502, he completed a work by a deceased lawyer of Ferrara, printed at the expense of the author's heirs. Soon afterward, Rubeis returned to Ferrara and to his book-selling and paper business. He died there in the year 1522.



Although Laurentius de Rubeis had ceased printing, his press was not extinguished. His son Francesco, who was born in 1503, began printing in 1521 at the age of eighteen and continued in the trade for fifty-two years, until the year 1573.

Rubeis employed a number of marks, of which the fifth is reproduced here. All his marks are variations of the cross-and-orb symbol (usually interpreted as signifying the earth dominated by Christianity). Within the orb is a rosette, possibly conveying a pun on the name of the printer—in Italian, de' Rossi; within the rosette are the initials of his name and birthplace.

The orb bears a quotation from the Vulgate (Luke 2:14), "GLORIA IN EXCELSIS DEO." The patriarchal cross transfixes a crown, which is supported by two flying angels. At the corners of the mark are the rayed busts of SS Jerome and Augustine, and a lion and eagle, the symbols of the evangelists Mark and John.

EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY

FOLGER SHAKESPEARE
LIBRARY

THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

LEON CARNOVSKY: for biographical information see the *Library Quarterly*, I (1931), 476; XII (1942), 763. Mr. Carnovsky has been professor of library science at the University of Chicago since 1944 and managing editor of the *Library Quarterly* since 1943. In 1946 he was a member of the United States Education Mission to Japan. In 1947 he served as consultant to the Publications Branch of the Information Control Division of OMGUS. In 1948 he was a member of the faculty of the first international library school conducted by UNESCO. He also participated in the surveys of the Chicago Public, Cleveland Public, and Los Angeles Public libraries. In addition, he has served as a member of the Subcommittee on Education for Librarianship of the International Federation of Library Associations and as chairman of the Committee on Intellectual Freedom of the A.L.A.; he is currently a member of the International Relations Board of the A.L.A.

Among publications of which Mr. Carnovsky is author or joint author are: *A Metropolitan Library in Action*, *The Library in the Community*, *Libraries and Readers in the State of New York*, and *Library Service in a Suburban Area*.

LEO SCHEVENHELs was born in Antwerp, Belgium, in 1921. He attended Teachers College in that city and graduated, in 1945, from the Antwerp Library School. He now holds the position of assistant librarian in the Antwerp Central Public Libraries. In addition, he is assistant to the secretary of the Flemish Library Association.

Mr. Schevenhels has contributed extensively to such publications as *De Bibliotheekgids*, *De Vlaamse Gids*, and *De Gulden Passer*. At present he is engaged in a bibliographical work, *Dutch Historical Novels*, and is also collaborating on a *Bibliography of Modern Dutch Literature*.

JOSEF STUMMVOLL was born in Baden near Vienna, Austria, in 1902. He graduated from the Technical University of Vienna in 1924 and re-

ceived his Ph.D. degree from the University of Leipzig in 1932. From 1925 to 1932 and again from 1937 to 1939 he was librarian at the Deutsche Bücherei in Leipzig. In the intervening years he organized and directed the library of the College for Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine at Ankara, Turkey. From 1939 to 1943 he worked at the library of the Reichspatentamt (Patent Office) in Berlin. Shortly after his return from military service, in 1946, he was appointed to his present position of deputy director of the Austrian National Library.

Mr. Stummvoll is the author of numerous publications and articles in technical, literary, and library periodicals. He is also a member of the Staatlicher Prüfungsausschuss für Bibliothekswesen ("state board of examiners for librarianship"). From October, 1948, to February, 1949, he traveled in the United States at the invitation of the Library of Congress and the A.L.A. to study American librarianship and lecture on his experiences in Austria.

MORTIMER TAUBE: for biographical information see the *Library Quarterly*, VII (1937), 434-35. From 1938 to 1940, Mr. Taube worked as cataloger at Rutgers University Library. Following that, he was placed in charge of acquisitions at Duke University Library. From 1944 until February, 1949, he held a series of positions in the Library of Congress, being, in turn, assistant chief of the General Reference and Bibliography Division, assistant director of the Acquisitions Department, head of the L.C. Mission in Europe, and acting director of the Acquisitions Department and chief of the Science and Technology Project. Since the beginning of 1949 he has been with the Atomic Energy Commission as assistant chief of its Technical Information Branch.

Mr. Taube has contributed numerous articles to *College and Research Libraries*, *Special Libraries*, *Philosophy of Science*, *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, and other publications.

REVIEWS

The Royal Society Scientific Information Conference, 21 June-2 July 1948: Report and Papers Submitted. London: Royal Society (Burlington House), 1948. Pp. 723. 26s. Copies are available from the Office of Technical Services, Commerce Department, Washington, D.C., at \$6.00, postage paid.

This volume contains a complete compilation of reports and papers considered at the Royal Society Scientific Information Conference held in London from June 21 to July 2, 1948.

The tremendous importance of science during World War II was recognized in Britain by the convening of two large-scale scientific conferences in 1946: the Royal Society Empire Scientific Conference, followed by the British Commonwealth Official Scientific Conference. During both these meetings the need for adequate scientific information services was treated as a major problem.

The Royal Society Scientific Conference recommended that the Royal Society "convene a conference of libraries, societies and institutions responsible for publishing, abstracting and information services, in order to examine the possibility of improvement in existing methods of collection, indexing and distribution of scientific literature, and for the extension of existing abstracting services."

The meeting of the British Commonwealth Official Scientific Conference later in 1946 adopted the following resolution:

The Conference endorses the general recommendation of the Royal Society's Conference but desires to record its opinion that such a discussion should be regarded as preliminary to a wider conference, invitations to which should be extended to the U.S.A. as well as to the operating agencies of the United Nations which are concerned with the subject.

In November, 1947, the Council of the Royal Society decided to act on this recommendation; it added that the conference should be limited to certain scientific subjects, such as agriculture, engineering, and medicine, but should exclude the social sciences. A parliamentary grant of funds was obtained, and the Organizing Committee for the conference, under the joint chair-

manship of Sir Alfred Egerton and Sir Edward Salisbury, secretaries of the Royal Society, held its first meeting in December, 1947. Invitations were sent to representative organizations in the United Kingdom engaged in the dissemination of scientific information. Similar invitations went to the governments of other countries in the British Commonwealth, to the National Academy of Sciences in the United States, and to UNESCO. All fellows of the Royal Society were invited to attend as delegates.

The plan adopted for the conference called for the work to be divided among four sections, with an editor in charge of each section. The delegates were divided into working parties within the sections, and a steering committee was appointed for each. Working parties were assigned specific problems and asked to produce definite and practical recommendations. In order that the delegates might have all possible evidence on which to base their recommendations, an exhibition was arranged in the rooms of the Royal Society. It included materials, processes, and machines in use and proposed for use in the publication and indexing of knowledge. Some were new; others provided a general background, showing applications, advantages, and difficulties of such conventional processes as, for example, printing. The displays were arranged in the following groups: (1) scientific journals, abstracts, and reviews; (2) printing and methods of reproduction; (3) classification in science; (4) mechanical indexing and sorting; and (5) microphotography and microfilm readers. In addition, it was arranged for working parties to visit publishing and information services.

The published report contains a complete description of the items exhibited (Appen. II, p. 225), as well as photographs of several of the exhibits and descriptions of the visits made to outside organizations (Appen. IV).

The opening session of the conference was devoted to addresses by distinguished scientists and British cabinet members. The principal address at the opening session was given by Professor E. N. da C. Andrade, F.R.S. Entitled "The Presentation of Scientific Information," it

represents a scholarly historical treatment of the problem since the earliest times.

Each section began its deliberations with a plenary session devoted to a comprehensive discussion of the scope of the problems before it. In some cases a lengthy address by the editor set forth the results of his own intensive study and analysis of the problem. For example, Professor J. D. Bernal presented a very detailed outline, based on his studies over many years, of the objectives of scientific publication. Dr. J. E. Holmstrom gave his section a similar address, wherein he elaborated on the purpose and scope of indexing and other library services as applied to scientific literature. The discussion may best be outlined as it was divided, i.e., section by section.

Section I: Publication and distribution of papers reporting original work.—Professor Bernal defines the objectives of scientific publication and distribution as highly practical ones: the satisfaction of the user and the advance of science. He explains that a worker may limit the scope of his interests sufficiently to be satisfied with slow and incomplete publications services, whereas the advance of science requires much more:

... The growing abundance of primary scientific publication and the confusion in which it is set out acts as a continuous brake, as an element of friction to the progress of science. We are not so much maintaining that scientific information is lost, though it may be, but that the scientific worker wastes time and effort in finding what information there is, and as a result we may be getting a far more limited and slower progress of research than we would under a better arranged system of publication.

The high cost involved in present methods is felt most keenly by junior workers, who need scientific information most. There must be a widespread awareness of the existence of such information relevant to any particular piece of work. The worker must be able to obtain maximum knowledge in minimum time and at minimum cost. Minimum time requires a definite limitation of the amount of material that must be read.

The different working parties in Section I were assigned to deal with (a) format and reproduction problems, (b) length of papers, (c) grouping of periodicals and possibility of new ones, (d) distribution of scientific literature, and (e) delay in publication and availability of actually published material.

Section II: Abstracting services.—In opening

this section, Sir David Chadwick comments upon the history of many well-known services, some of which, he says, have been in existence for over seventy years. One of the principal problems, as he sees it, is this:

Very large portions of science and of its application are thus already covered by published abstracts, but clearly some portions are not. There are gaps between the services and no cohesion exists amongst them as a whole. No complete list of journals publishing abstracts in the United Kingdom is readily available; consequently no means exist of knowing quickly which branches of science and of its applications are covered by abstracts.

Subjects for investigation in Section II were divided among the working parties as follows: (a) scope and quality of present abstracting, (b) techniques of abstracting, and (c) co-operation between abstracting organizations. The report on this section contains the experiences of many scientists in operating and using abstracting services.

Section III: Indexing and other library services.—The work of this section is summed up and synthesized in the comprehensive address by Dr. J. E. Holmstrom (pp. 77 ff.). He defines the problem before his section as

... the development of mass processing techniques for so disposing references to scientific literature as to facilitate retrospective searching: that is, methods of arranging these references in such a way that any of them which might help to satisfy whatever particular quests for data may arise in the future are sure to be turned up, if and when the occasion arises, with the least possible delay and the greatest possible certainty. This is a problem which includes what is ordinarily understood by librarianship but goes far beyond it in magnitude and complexity.

He explains that a single book or article may be relevant to many subjects. The individual items of information to be made accessible run into millions, and the scientist's time and power of attention must be carefully husbanded. This requires effective techniques of control to give him access to his specific information in the minimum time. The three techniques known at present for accomplishing this are listed by Holmstrom as (1) alphabetical indexing, (2) classification, and (3) coding references for mechanical selection. The differentiation which Holmstrom makes between these three techniques is expanded in his discussion beginning on page 79 of the report. In connection with the third, he describes the Bush Rapid Selector being developed by Ralph Shaw in the Depart-

ment of Agriculture library, the UNIVAC, and applications of both—as well as of the better-known punched-card machines—to information problems. One of the novel applications he describes is an adaptation of punched cards invented by Dr. Samain of Paris, whose equipment was presented in the exhibition. Dr. Holmstrom continues with a description of microfilm and its possible alternatives and goes on to discuss such topics as reference books, data compilations, the training of workers in information work, and the problem of translation.

The detailed work of Section III was divided among the delegates under the headings: (a) classification, (b) methods of reproduction, (c) mechanical indexing, (d) training and employment in information work, (e) guidance to information, and (f) translations.

Section IV: Reviews, annual reports, etc.—Section editor H. Munro Fox, editor of *Biological Reviews*, sums up the task before his section by explaining the great variety of concepts which people have of reviews and annual reports; these may appear at regular intervals, or they may appear at random. The best reviews, according to Professor Fox, are not mere summaries of recent research; they must add new theoretical interpretations, and they must be critical. Properly qualified authors for this work are very hard to find. It is particularly difficult to persuade specialists to write material comprehensible to nonspecialists. Review journals must of necessity be international, in that they must cover the work in their field on a world-wide basis and require contributions by foreign scientists. Symposiums on special subjects are becoming increasingly important as equivalents of subject reviews. The need for the review treatment is particularly acute in applied branches of the sciences.

A single working party, made up of all the delegates in Section IV, emphasizes the value of critical and constructive reviews by senior scientists both to junior workers in their own field and to specialists in other branches of science. The work required to produce such reviews must receive recognition comparable to that now given other scientific work.

In addition to the formal papers, reports, and supporting appendixes, the present volume includes many useful papers from journals and other meetings which provide compilations of collected data and analyses of various facets of the information problem. There are sixty-seven such items, ranging from topics such as compre-

hensive lists of abstract journals in the British Commonwealth, legal opinions on the impact of copyright laws on microfilm practices, to the analysis by Professor Bernal of the answers to his questionnaire on the use of scientific literature.

This book will serve as an excellent reference work for those interested in the development of a real science of librarianship. It does not pretend to answer the problems that constantly beset us all. It does, however, to a remarkable degree point up and analyze these problems. The compilation of the thoughts and experiences of so many distinguished scientists will provide valuable guidance for any future research in the organization of knowledge.

NORMAN T. BALL

National Military Establishment
Washington, D.C.

The Library's Public: A Report of the Public Library Inquiry. By BERNARD BERELSON with the assistance of LESTER ASHEIM. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. xx+174. \$3.00.

This book is reviewed with great hesitancy. Many people, having read a review, conclude that they know enough and that reading the book is unnecessary. This book is essential reading for all librarians, whether the executive "boss" or the newly recruited junior.

It is, of course, one volume in the series which will be known as the "Leigh Report"—the result of the Public Library Inquiry conducted by a group of expert investigators under the direction of Dr. Robert D. Leigh. The major significance of the whole undertaking, which is apparent throughout this volume, is the detached and scientific manner in which the project has been carried out. At last we are "investigated" not by ourselves but by trained observers. Dr. Leigh's own volume is not yet ready. He will bring together the findings of the whole Inquiry and submit an analytical interpretation of them.

In the present volume Berelson makes it clear at the outset that his book, for the most part, "is a description, not an evaluation" and that "the report attempts to tell what the public library does, not what it can do or should do." Therein rests its main value. Some of its conclusions we already knew. Individually we have brooded over them for years. But the

data, gathered together now by accepted scientific methods, indicate that most of our problems are common. We know that we reach only a minority of our population. Berelson shows us that things are even worse than we thought. If we take a "user" of a public library to mean someone who uses the library at least once a month, we touch only 10 per cent of adults and 33 per cent of children and young people. Also, we used to think that, so far as the general reading public was concerned, the public library was its main source of book-supply. It appears, however, that people get 25 per cent of their book-reading from the public library, 20 per cent from friends, 35 per cent from purchase or the home library, 8 per cent from rentals, and 10 per cent from other sources.

Again, we have long known (in our own localities) that "use of the library falls off sharply at the school-leaving age," and we have tried to adjust "techniques" to counteract this "leakage"—with little success. Berelson shows that "under present conditions the public library attracts a progressively smaller proportion of people in each successive higher age level." His analysis, however, carries a definite hope for the future. He relates library use to popular educational levels and prophesies that, just as "public library circulation today, per capita, is from 200 to 400 per cent greater than it was thirty years ago," so also, "as formal education is the major correlate of the use of public libraries . . . because the formal educational level of the population is still rising and presumably will continue to rise for at least the next decade, there is a strong probability that use of the public libraries will rise with it."

Nevertheless, even though we do directly reach only a small minority of our population, the data show that "the book readers in any community are prominent members of a group who are interested in communication in general"; that, "even more than do book readers in general, public library users as a class represent a kind of 'communications elite'—people who spend a good deal of time in seeing, reading, and listening to communications of various kinds"; that, "if it reaches the people who influence other people, then the public library can claim a special significance for its services. The available evidence suggests that there is a positive relationship between library use and community leadership." This string of facts, however, while giving us a touch of com-

fort, should not lead us to think in terms of our catering only to this "communications elite" and being either flattered or complacent about it. As has been suggested above, we have hopes of an increasing clientele during the next decade, but we shall have to strive for it. This is all the more true since the appeals of other mediums of communication outbid ours. From 90 to 95 per cent of the adult population listens to the radio for fifteen minutes a day or more; 85-90 per cent reads one or more newspapers more or less regularly; 60-70 per cent reads one or more magazines more or less regularly; 45-50 per cent sees a motion picture once every two weeks or oftener; only 25-30 per cent of the adult population reads one or more books a month.

Among the many other significant conclusions in this book, an especially important one rests on the investigation of the "additional services" which public libraries are now tending to undertake: films, records, discussion groups, etc. Berelson says:

Would such services attract new clients to the library, or would they be used mainly by the present clientele? On the whole the projected services would be used relatively more by those who at present use the library than by others. Thus, the new services would not so much attract new people to the public library as provide fuller and more satisfactory services to the people who already use the library. . . . Briefly, the new activities would provide a supplementary service for the library's present clientele.

Add to this another factor which is thrown up: broadly, there is general satisfaction with library service on the part of the public, *but*, where there was criticism, "the overwhelming majority of unsatisfied demands was due to the inadequacy of the book collection of the library." And, of course, as Berelson points out, the book stock is basically affected by the budget. It may easily happen, therefore, that the "additional services" may result in a depletion of the book stocks, a process which may even now be going on. Is the phrase "fuller and more satisfactory services" in the above quotation really justified? Are we weakening our main purpose, which admittedly is "book-reading," by taking on "additional services"?

There are many other topics which could be mentioned: the influence of librarians themselves on "ideas about books to read" (we come off poorly); the use of catalogs; the relationship of reference to circulation work; the influence of the policy of book acquisition. The book is pepper-potted with interesting tables, includes

an excellent Bibliography, and inspires additional confidence in the reader by the "Note on Method," on which the whole investigation rests. Each chapter has its own "Summary" as its concluding section. The chapters headed "What Further Research Is Needed?" and "The Implications for Library Policy" are full of raw meat awaiting cooking.

CHARLES R. SANDERSON

Toronto Public Library

The Information Film: A Report of the Public Library Inquiry. By GLORIA WALDRON. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. xviii + 281. \$3.75.

The conclusions reached in this study made for the Public Library Inquiry are not startling, but they reaffirm the conviction now held by many librarians that public libraries are logical agencies for the distribution of films. Library film service is a relatively new development and, except for a few isolated instances, has a history which reaches back only as far as the early forties. Its growth, however, has been remarkable, and this report gives us an opportunity to examine library accomplishments and to re-study the decisions which first led libraries to undertake the service. Some librarians have felt that the whole movement represents an unfortunate detour on a fashionable dead-end street. The Public Library Inquiry finds that film service moves along the main highway, pointing toward traditional library goals.

The author of the report, Gloria Waldron, is a member of the educational staff of the Twentieth Century Fund and has been closely connected with the Fund's film program. She begins her book with a survey of the nontheatrical film, considering its history, scope, and potential values. She follows this with chapters devoted specifically to production, distribution, and use. The material is summarized with considerable success, although the distinction between fundamental developments and current news has not been a basic test in decisions on what to include. The point of view is critical, perhaps opinionated at times, but a firm belief in the film as a "new dimension in education" dominates the text.

The outline of the report as a whole was probably shaped by committee decision, and the

author may not be personally responsible for the fact that only about 75 of its 281 pages are devoted, in any tangible way, to public libraries. The purposes of the Public Library Inquiry are not revealed in earlier chapters, where a certain shyness toward the idea of libraries gives rise to some wonderment concerning the reading audience to which the report is addressed.

Three chapters are devoted entirely to library film service; librarians, reporting through questionnaires and interviews, are largely responsible for their content. They include an excellent commentary on the desirability of film service, an analysis of the service in eight unnamed libraries, and a roundup of various problems concerning library film collections. The reports from libraries which one recognizes to be Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Akron are stimulating and persuasive; but the general effect of these chapters may make the reader underestimate the skill and certainty with which many libraries have inaugurated and carried forward their film work.

Librarians already engaged in the service will undoubtedly feel that the report has been unable to keep pace with the vigorous growth in the field. There will be some regret that no more specific information has been given on co-operative and regional service, since it is obviously unwise for the smaller library to work alone. The film librarian will note that the problem of training for this specialized work has been neglected, and all librarians will feel the lack of guidance toward further development of the service that would give everyone in the country reasonably easy access to films.

But librarians will, in the conclusion of the report, see their own activities as part of a larger pattern of organization. As a solution to the widespread problems of production and distribution, Miss Waldron recommends (1) a national film center subsidized for the encouragement of production; (2) the Film Council of America as a center of research on the national level and as an organizer of audiences in the local community; and (3) the public library as a center of information and as a local depository for films, working independently or as part of a regional or state network. It is certainly through some such plan of organization that the present disorder will be resolved and the information film attain a measure of stability.

GERALD D. McDONALD

New York Public Library

The First Quarter Century of the Pierpont Morgan Library: A Retrospective Exhibition in Honor of Belle da Costa Greene, April 5 through July 23, 1949. With a tribute to the library and its first director by LAWRENCE C. WROTH. New York: Pierpont Morgan Library, 1949. Pp. 67. Pls. 49. \$3.00.

At the Pierpont Morgan Library, on April 5, 1949, an exhibition of 256 items was opened. In the catalog describing them these items are divided into six groups.

The first and most magnificent group is comprised of seventy-four illuminated manuscripts. These include a sixth-century Gospels of Mark, Luke, and John, in Syriac; a German tenth-century manuscript of the Latin Gospels; a twelfth-century Gospels written at Canterbury; the Psalter and Book of Hours prepared for Yolande (Vicomtesse de Soissons) and the Missal of Abbot Berthold (executed at the Abbey of Weingarten), both thirteenth century; a French manuscript of the fourteenth century with beautiful miniatures of *Lancelot du Lac*; Sacro Bosco's *Sphaera mundi* (Austrian of the fifteenth century); a *Marco Polo* and a *Livre du Roy Modus* (both French and fifteenth century); and a sixteenth-century Turkish treatise on astrology.

The next group, "Bindings," includes examples executed for Henri II and Diane de Poitiers, for Ann Bacon and her son Francis Bacon, and for Lord Burghley, Henrietta Maria (when widow of Charles I), Mme de Pompadour, Marie Antoinette, Lafayette, and Napoleon.

The third group, "Drawings and Prints," begins with William Blake's "River of Oblivion" and includes a fourteenth-century Florentine drawing of "The Holy Family Leaving Nazareth for the Passover Celebration," Gainsborough's chalk portrait of the Duchess of Devonshire, Sir Thomas Lawrence's portrait of the celebrated Shakespearean actress Mrs. Siddons, and eight etchings by Rembrandt.

Books which the average bibliophile knows about but seldom sees fill the fourth section of this exhibition—"Early Printed Books." One of the most interesting items in this group is the 1455 Mainz Indulgence—in the catalog confidently assigned to the press of Johann Gutenberg and identified as the "earliest dated piece of printing in America" (p. 48, No. 135). This reviewer was impressed with the magnificent presswork testifying to great care and skill on the part of the printers, to whom this sheet must

have been merely an ephemeral item of job printing.

Other examples must be mentioned: five Caxtons, the Ratdolt *Graduale* of 1494, the 1492 Lübeck St. Birgitta's *Revelationes*, and the first editions of principal works of Julius Caesar, Lydgate, Strabo, Cicero, Euripides, Anacreon, Ptolemy, Vesalius, and Copernicus.

The fifth section of the catalog, "Later Printed Books," includes first editions of *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, Ascham's *The Scholemaster*, Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, Gilbert's *De Magnete*, Galileo's *Dialogo*, Byron's *Private Correspondence* (suppressed and possibly unique), Dickens' *The Pickwick Papers* and *A Christmas Carol*, Browning's *Asolando* (proof copy with corrections), and Kipling's *Letters of Marque*.

"Autograph Manuscripts, Letters, and Documents" form the last section of the exhibition. Here we find original manuscripts of the first half of Locke's *An Essay concerning Human Understanding*, Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey*, Rossetti's *The Blessed Damozel*, Barrie's *Shall We Join the Ladies?*, Scott's *The Antiquary*, Dickens' *Our Mutual Friend*, and Emerson's "Behavior." Here also are 173 letters of Thomas Jefferson; a letter of Anne Boleyn; a letter of John Paul Jones, addressed to Robert Morris, describing the battle between the "Bonhomme Richard" and the "Serapis." Here, too, are the autograph notes of Robert Fulton on the use of underwater torpedoes; Francis Bacon's *Humble Submission to the House of Lords*; a document signed by Ferdinand and Isabella; a confirmation of a grant of Henry I, believed to be the oldest document signed by an English king; and a pathetic petition dated December 9, 1692, by Rebecca Eames to the governor of Massachusetts. (Under sentence of death as a witch, she protests her innocence and implores pardon.) The exhibition ends somberly with a letter of Galileo lamenting his persecutions.

The exhibition may be described as a galaxy of high spots. The catalog which accompanies it does justice to the exhibition. Each item is fully described, and forty-nine items are illustrated by forty-eight halftone plates and one four-color plate. The material is elaborately indexed. And the catalog is beautifully printed by the Spiral Press of New York.

This catalog, however, is more than a description of an exhibition. Nearly one-third of its pages are devoted to "A Tribute to the Li-

brary and Its First Director," illustrated by a photogravure plate of a photograph by Clarence White of Miss Belle da Costa Greene in a characteristic pose (opp. p. 26). Dr. Wroth describes the formation of the Pierpont Morgan Library. He tells of Miss Greene's coming from the Princeton University Library (where she had been a cataloger) to become Mr. Morgan's librarian in 1905, of her work in the Morgan Collection, of her appointment as director when the Pierpont Morgan Library was incorporated for public use in 1924, and of her career as director. Her success in this office is apparent from this catalog. The 256 items on exhibition are part of a much larger number of well-chosen rarities acquired during her directorship.

Dr. Wroth relates numerous interesting anecdotes of Miss Greene. He ends by citing instances of her helpfulness to scholars. This reviewer remembers, to mention one example, her kindness to him, a quarter of a century ago, in furnishing him photostats of rare material for use in a University of Chicago Master's thesis. He feels that many others whom Miss Greene has aided in their scholarly careers will join with him in applauding the holding of this exhibition in her honor.

EDWIN ELLIOTT WILLOUGHBY

Folger Shakespeare Library

Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1948. Issued by the LIBRARY OF CONGRESS. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949. Pp. 199.

Since the Library of Congress is the very leviathan of libraries, a report of its annual activities must be the epitome of all library reports. The Library of Congress is a public library by usage, a special library by statute (the Legislative Reference Service being perhaps the largest of the special libraries, its clientele certainly the most influential in the United States), and a university library in that it is a mandatory port of call for many researchers. By virtue of its governmental sponsorship, the Library must assume bibliothecal responsibilities of national and international import. Thus its annual report might properly become a subject for study by every chief librarian. Furthermore, in almost any field it might well claim the attention of scholars who keep up with the location of source material, for among its supplements

are the four issues of the *Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions*, in which the Library of Congress reviews its stores and advertises its increments more fully than does any other library (except perhaps the New York Public Library) in the United States.

The present *Report* summarizes the diverse and extensive activities of the Library of Congress in admirable style and organization. It may be useful to try a sampling of events that set this report apart from its predecessors—for example, the "theme" of the report: the effect of reduced appropriations in the face of the general salary increase required by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1947 and of a notable growth in the use of the Library. This situation resulted in the reduction of personnel, of service hours, and of bibliographies prepared, as well as in the elimination of such activities as those of the Motion Picture Project and the Hearings Unit of the Legislative Reference Service.

This retarding of progress may be blamed on the national political situation; with equal justice it can be ascribed to the conflict between the narrow view of the Library's function held by the successive House Appropriations committees and that function as defined by the Library's activity since 1901. Those who have followed the course of the Library of Congress under its present administration will recall that the issue was raised by the massive \$9,700,000 budget request for the fiscal year 1947, an estimate described in the 1947 *Report* as "in major part a realistic statement of the operational requirements of the Library within the terms of its present program." That "present program" was a forty-odd years' accumulation of response to demands from Congress, federal agencies, and the country's citizens and libraries, ratified—piecemeal—in budgetary terms by successive appropriations.

The issue called forth the monumental report of 1946, with Mearns' "The Story Up to Now," the "Justification of Estimates . . . 1947," and the appointment of the Library of Congress Planning Committee. The committee's report in March, 1947, went to the Committee on Administration of each house. There it presumably still lies buried, for the present *Report* states that no action was taken in the fiscal year 1948, and none has been heard of since then. This awkward suspension of fundamental policy decisions cannot long continue without serious harm to the national library and to the other libraries of the country.

The current *Annual Report* contains the history of the attempt of the House Appropriations Committee to charge a part of the Library's cataloging costs to the libraries purchasing printed cards. The committee dealing with the Library's estimates for 1950 reversed its predecessors' unfortunate policy and abolished the cataloging charge. In effect, however, there has been no reduction in the price charged to subscribing libraries, as the elimination of the cataloging fee has been offset by the increased cost of the cards themselves.

As an organizer and substantial participator in co-operative ventures, the Library of Congress contributes directly to the welfare of many, especially scholarly, libraries. Its role in the Co-operative Acquisitions Project (whose successful termination is here reported), in the American Book Center and its successor organization, in the Farmington Plan, and in the Documents Expediting Project is well known. To this list the present *Report* adds the *Monthly List of Russian Accessions* and an information clearing-house for microfilm projects.

No library administrator responsible for—and to—a staff of some size can afford to ignore the thumbnail essay on staff participation in the Library's management and the description of its many devices for realizing this participation (pp. 30-32, 106). While the number and levels of discussion groups would be excessive for a smaller staff, the program is enormously suggestive.

Among the noteworthy events of 1948 are the consolidation of the Acquisitions and Processing departments; the substitution of serial volumes already bound by the publisher for expensive collating and binding; successful experimentation by the Science and Technology Project with punched-card and punched-tape equipment in bibliographical control, and the conclusion that punched-card technique cannot be profitably applied to the production of the *Cumulative Catalog*; admission that the centralized handling of serials "still produced problems which remained in part unsolved"; and a note reporting that the burglar-alarm system of the Freedom Train "went into operation when Governor Dewey and his aides entered the Train for Armistice Day ceremonies at Albany."

This review cannot close without pointing to one feature of the *Report* which is likely to escape the rapid reader. Interspersed throughout the 114 pages of its text occur general observations on library affairs, running from a few sen-

tences to a column or more, which are worth careful study. They are the distillation of the thought and discussions of what is probably the largest and most active group of librarians in any single library today. The subjects range from the utilization of space (p. 39) to such topics as co-operation (pp. 16-17), library photography (p. 45), centralized cataloging (pp. 18-19, 21), problems of handling technical data (p. 51), acquisition work (p. 75), and the uses and usefulness of the catalog card (p. 88).

DONALD CONEY

University of California Library
Berkeley, California

Fourteenth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States for the Year Ending June 30, 1948. ("National Archives Publication," No. 49-20.) Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949. Pp. v+65.

Ninth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States on the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, N.Y., for the Year Ending June 30, 1948. ("National Archives Publication," No. 49-19.) Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949. Pp. iii+18.

Previous annual reports of the archivist have dwelt at length upon the great masses of records assembled during the war and the advisability of departmental programs providing schedules for systematic disposal of worthless, noncurrent papers. This gospel of planned records administration, confirmed as sound doctrine by an executive order of September, 1946, has begun to yield benefits. The careful screening and orderly retirement of records, especially by World War II emergency agencies, resulted in a smaller total of new accessions to the National Archives during the year under review than in the preceding one: only 58,507 cubic feet as compared with 82,967 cubic feet. In fact, the amount accessioned was down near the prewar level. It is believed that the seemingly endless pyramiding of government records has been stopped. More recent and rather impressive cost figures for records storage compiled by a task force of the Hoover Commission appear to argue that great savings can be effected in this phase of government despite the progress which is being made.

The greatest increase during the year 1947-48 was in reference service: approximately 86,000 requests, i.e., 24,000 above the previous

year. The handling of this considerable work load calls for commendation, when one bears in mind that a major reorganization, initiated in January, 1947, was still in progress and that the most extensive reduction in force in the agency's history began six months thereafter. In personnel, the turnover was 31 per cent and included the position of the archivist, in which Dr. Solon J. Buck was succeeded by Wayne C. Grover.

The archivist feels that one of the major problems is to achieve a balance between the amount of reference service and the volume of analytic, descriptive work. The time element in reference work should be lessened appreciably by the new comprehensive *Guide to the Records in the National Archives*, which went to the printer during the period of this report and has since been published. There remains unsolved the basic problem of inadequate space for the residue of records certain to come up for acceptance into the Archives before long; it is expected that two more years will see the building on Pennsylvania Avenue filled to overflowing.

At the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, too, there was a major personnel change, with Herman Kahn succeeding Fred W. Shipman as director. The significant event of the year there was a ruling by the Surrogate's Court of Dutchess County validating the late President's gift of his papers and files to the library. The ruling that he had "effectively disposed" of them before drawing his last will means that they are not to be regarded as a part of his estate and that the title to them is clear. For a second successive year, over 300,000 persons paid to be admitted to the library building, which includes museum galleries as well as library and archival sections.

ROBERT W. HILL

New York Public Library

The Indian Archives, Vol. I, No. 2 (April, 1947).

Published quarterly. Queensway, New Delhi: National Archives of India. Pp. 94. Annual subscription, Rs. 8.

The archivist of some far-off Indian province sitting down to peruse his copy of the second number of this newly established professional quarterly will find in it a great deal to inform and stimulate him. In its six original articles on archival theory and practice, its two reprints, its summary of the Indian Historical Records

Commission's twenty-third session, and its news notes and book-review sections, there is ample evidence of the successful carrying-out of the editorial intention "to popularize knowledge and to give publicity to plain facts and simple precepts not usually within the reach of the ordinary student."

There is a good balance of archival topics. The first and fourth articles, "Raw Material of History," by Sir Maurice Gwyer, vice-chancellor of Delhi University, and "Laws of Archival Science," by S. R. Ranganathan, professor of library science at the same university, offer something of general theory in simplicity of form. Sir Maurice's address, the first of a series of radio broadcasts, outlines the aims and activities of the Indian Historical Records Commission and describes the program of the Regional Survey Committees that were set up in 1943 under its auspices to encourage the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, the "raw material of history."

Dr. Ranganathan, in the first of two articles intended to form a code, asserts the first law of archival science to be the preservation of the physical material forever. "For an archive," he says, "it is not only the thought embodied that is immortal, but also the particular physical body entrusted to its care. An archive recognizes no transmigration of soul, as it were." The corollaries of this first law, then, naturally concern themselves with the development of scientific techniques for preserving, repairing, and storing archives.

The problem of the preservation of archival materials is especially interesting and vitally important to the Indian archivist, as evidenced by the fact that not only do all the original articles touch upon the subject, but two of them and one of the reprints are devoted entirely to it. Jean Filliozat, head of the Department of Oriental Manuscripts at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, in an article reflecting one of India's peculiar problems in the matter of strange record materials, discusses "Manuscripts on Birch Bark (Bhurjapatra) and Their Preservation." The results of testing of an insecticide, which cannot be recommended because of its weakening and aging effect upon paper, are reported by S. Chakravorti and P. C. Majumbar, two chemists of the Imperial Record Department, New Delhi, in "A Note on 'Sulph-arsenic.'" The article by E. A. Back entitled "Bookworms," here reprinted from the *Annual Report* of the Smithsonian Institution

for the year 1930, is well known to every American librarian. The problem inherent in the high incidence in tropical and subtropical India of deterioration among paper records and books shows clearly in the choice for publication of such articles as these, as well as in such other articles as the "Library of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute," by its librarian, K. K. Guha Roy, who dwells upon the deleterious effects of climate and adverse storage conditions upon that library's collections.

Institutional history constitutes the topic of this and another of the remaining articles, "The State Archives of South Africa" by Coenraad Beyers, chief archivist for the Union of South Africa.

The final article, entitled "Editing Modern Historical Documents," is the report made in 1924 by a subcommittee of the Anglo-American Historical Committee appointed in October, 1921, by the Conference of Anglo-American Historians. It is here reprinted from Volume III (1925/26) of the *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research. This excellent report should still serve as an effective guide to the publisher of manuscript material.

Of special interest to the Indian archivist, and of only slightly lesser interest to the rest of the archival world, are the extensive "News Notes," which occupy nearly one-third of the space in this issue. These give very full reports of the accessions, the laboratory activities, and the publication programs of the Indian archival agencies, and brief notes of foreign archives. The summary reports of the Regional Survey Committees describe in cheering fashion the progress of this nation-wide survey.

The journal as a whole is a fine piece of work, and a well-indexed file of it will provide the Indian archivist with an adequate handbook at the same time that it creates in him a sense of his developing profession. If there is a fault to find, it is that the date of the original printing of the reprints is not given, so that the Indian archivist, without other resources, cannot know that the article by E. A. Back was first published ten years ago or that the report of the Anglo-American Historical Committee is now twenty-five years old. It is to be hoped that the editors will in the future include such vital information.

DOROTHY V. MARTIN

National Archives Library

M.I.T. Library Annual, 1948. Edited by VERNON D. TATE and MARGARET P. HAZEN. Cambridge, Mass.: Library, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1948. Pp. 84. \$0.75.

Librarians of American colleges and universities have been preparing reports for their superior officers since the first book collections were assembled. The pattern, for a long time, changed little: statistics of growth and use, notes about important acquisitions, statements of needs, and recommendations. Occasionally, however, an early librarian would record his observations on the use of the book collection and philosophize on its proper function in the institution. Some nineteenth-century observations were, in fact, so modern that our philosophy of librarianship has not been appreciably advanced by the voluminous literature of recent decades. Unfortunately, however, most of these statements lie buried in trustees' minutes and seldom come to light. Nevertheless, annual reports represent one's best source in the neglected field of library history. And it is encouraging, in these middle years of the twentieth century, to find them increasing in number and importance of content.

Librarians, with ever larger and more distinguished collections under their direction, are recognizing their obligation to the scholarly world to describe these resources, and they are making the annual report one of the vehicles for such description. Several major research libraries have lately founded journals for the purpose of giving the library's resources and activities still more complete coverage.

The *M.I.T. Library Annual, 1948* combines the features of the traditional annual report with those of the highly regarded modern journals. Described by its editor as an experiment, its aim is to "provide a medium for the presentation of factual information about Institute libraries and collections not limited to the span of a single year, for the discussion of current problems and projects, and for the circulation of views, opinions and comments."

Dean John Burchard, formerly director of libraries at M.I.T., opens the volume with a sparkling piece, "Multum in Parvo," to which he appends the names of three hundred authors, whose one thousand volumes, even in these days of five-million-volume libraries, would go a long way toward giving a man a general education. President James Killian follows with a summary of publishing at M.I.T. In "The Library and the

Technique of Research," the present director of libraries points to the library's responsibility as a teaching agency. A description of the magnificent Gaffield collection of books and manuscripts relating to the glass industry and a history of the Rotch Library of Architecture are among the other features of the *Annual*. The last fifteen pages contain the annual facts and figures.

The volume adds up to a substantial body of information about libraries at M.I.T. and about librarianship in general. The paper and typography contribute to a format that is distinctive. Friends and alumni of M.I.T. will be pleased with the *Annual*, and the library world in general will hope that the "experiment" is regarded in Cambridge as successful.

BENJAMIN E. POWELL

Duke University

Investment in People: The Story of the Julius Rosenwald Fund. By EDWIN R. EMBREE and JULIA WAXMAN. New York: Harper & Bros., 1949. Pp. xiii+291. \$3.00.

Investment in People: The Story of the Julius Rosenwald Fund is the kind of book that any librarian, teacher, or social worker should read occasionally if for no other reason than that of personal morale-building. For it is the fascinating story of a businessman whose commercial activities were highly successful and whose philanthropic undertakings have brought blessings to millions of his fellow-men. It is the story of wise investment in people, which, in the course of thirty-odd years, has paid dividends in health, education, and human understanding throughout America. Its tonic virtue is that it illustrates how wise planning accompanied by financial support, if carried on purposefully for a number of years, can result in great cumulative good.

The first three chapters deal with American foundations at the beginning of the twentieth century, the life of Julius Rosenwald, and an outline of the Fund's history. Influenced by the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, Mr. Rosenwald selected the South, particularly the Negro in the South, as the special object of his philanthropy. And in setting up the Julius Rosenwald Fund of some \$20,000,000, he announced a new formula in foundation management when he required its administrators to

spend the principal as well as the interest within twenty-five years.

Chapters iv to vii tell how the money was invested. Education (chap. iv) was promoted through a school-building program for Negroes which resulted in the erection of 5,357 school-houses in the South at a total cost of \$28,408,520; between 1929 and 1936 library service was improved and extended to the entire population of eleven southern counties at a cost of \$493,387; a program of teacher education for Negroes resulted in the improvement of the preparation of Negro teachers and the equalization, in several states, of their pay with that of white teachers; and, finally, the development (at a cost of \$2,789,312) of Negro university centers at Washington, Nashville, Atlanta, and New Orleans has greatly increased the opportunities for profitable college and university training for Negroes within the region.

The fifth chapter deals specifically with Negro health, with special emphasis upon measures to combat syphilis and tuberculosis, and with the study of the cost of medical care to the great majority of the American public, a project which resulted in the publication of *The Costs of Medical Care* and *Medical Care for the American People*. These reports stimulated the organization of such movements as the Blue Cross hospitalization plan, now involving some twenty-five or thirty million people, and have profoundly influenced present-day thinking about the provision of medical services on a national basis.

Two of the most important activities of the Fund were the provision of 1,537 fellowships and the organization and support of the Commission on Interracial Co-operation (chaps. vi and vii). The list of fellows includes the names of scores of Negroes and whites distinguished in many fields, and the work of the Commission on Interracial Co-operation has led to a better understanding of the problems of all minority groups in America. Greater opportunity for Negroes in many fields of work and more adequate protection before the law have grown out of the activities of this organization.

For the librarian the volume has additional significance. It reviews the demonstration of county library service in the South, lists the holders of fellowships in the field of library science and the grants to southern colleges and universities for library purposes, and analyzes the grants for all purposes representing a total expenditure by the Fund of \$22,249,624. Alto-

gether, the story is one of the greatest human interest and merits the attention of all people who devote their lives to the advancement of the public through the diffusion of knowledge.

LOUIS R. WILSON

University of North Carolina

"Report of the Proceedings of the Second Pre-conference Workshop for Librarians and Rural Sociologists . . . December 27, 1948." Issued by the JOINT COMMITTEE of the AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION and the RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY in co-operation with A.L.A. LIBRARY EXTENSION DIVISION. Pp. 32. \$0.75. (Mimeographed.) Distributed by the American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago 11, Ill.

This is an almost verbatim report of the discussions held during the three sessions of this one-day workshop. Like its predecessor, the report of a similar workshop held eleven months earlier, it is based on Soundsciber recordings, transcribed and prepared for mimeograph publication by Irving Lieberman of the A.L.A. staff. The result has the virtue of completeness and accuracy but is not especially conducive to sustained interest and coherent thought on the part of the reader.

In the relatively small group of less than fifty participants who comprised the workshop, sociologists and librarians were about equal in number, and all the A.L.A. regions were represented. These conditions were apparently favorable for the technique, employed several times by the chairman, of dividing the members into random groups of five or six, each group to discuss a specific question with a spokesman and to report its conclusions at the end of five or ten minutes.

The recommendations of the previous workshop furnished a springboard for a review of co-operative accomplishments and developments in the field of library extension during 1948. This, in turn, led to a discussion of future library demonstrations, to be held if and when the pending legislation on this subject is enacted by the Congress. It was agreed that librarians particularly needed the assistance of sociologists in the planning and evaluation of such demonstrations and that the rural sociologists would welcome requests for such services from librarians.

As usual, the question of funds entered the discussion and led to one of the final recommen-

dations, namely, that the two organizations responsible for the workshop request financial assistance for research projects from such sources as educational, scientific, or philanthropic foundations. Other resolutions adopted by the workshop were directed toward the following achievements:

Establishment of effective means of communication between librarians and rural sociologists with regard to such matters as current developments in library demonstration and evaluation

Securing participation of additional specialized groups from the social sciences in the established co-operative working relationships of the rural sociologists and librarians

Preparation of minimum planning standards for library demonstration and evaluation programs

Plans for co-operative workshops in connection with the 1949 A.L.A. regional meetings

These recommendations seem a bit more specific than those evolved by the first workshop, and it will be interesting to see what practical results will be reported at the next conference of the joint committee.

ELEANOR H. MORGAN

*California State Library
Sacramento, California*

"Survey of the Saginaw Library System: Final Report." By MARGARET E. EGAN, JOSEPH L. WHEELER, WILMA BENNETT, and JESSE H. SHERA. December, 1948. Pp. 132. (Hectographed.) For information regarding price and distribution write to Miss Beatrice Prall, Librarian, Hoyt Memorial Library, Saginaw, Mich.

This survey of the library system in Saginaw, Michigan, was undertaken by the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago at the request of the Saginaw Board of Trustees and with the co-operation of the library staff and the Saginaw board of education.

The study was made during 1948 under the direction of Margaret E. Egan of the Graduate Library School, with three special consultants, each of whom has written part of the report. Mr. Joseph E. Wheeler, librarian emeritus of the Enoch Pratt Free Library of Baltimore, made a study of the building problems; Miss Wilma Bennett, of the Library School of the University of Wisconsin, investigated the school-library

situation; and Jesse H. Shera, of the University of Chicago, examined the technical processes. Graduate students acted as survey assistants.

The aim of the survey was to solve some specific problems raised by the library board and the librarian and to plan the development of the library so that it might meet the needs of the community for years to come. Special help was sought to determine how the present complicated financial and administrative organization could be simplified and whether the present main building should be remodeled or abandoned and to examine the relation of the public library to the schools, the stock of materials, the processes of operation, and the possibilities for future services to the public. All these subjects are discussed in the report and recommendations made for future action.

The Introduction, which states the problems to be covered, is followed by short historical sketches of Saginaw and the formerly separate libraries in the city. A description and analysis of the community introduces the chapter on administration. Maps of the city show the house rentals by ward, the proportion of nonwhite residents, and the distribution of library borrowers.

Mr. Wheeler's forty-one-page chapter is a thorough study of the arrangement, allotment of space, and architecture of the main building. Describing it as of the Richardson type, "ancient rather than modern in its whole conception," he can find few points in its favor. He discusses some possible rearrangements within the present building, as well as alternate plans for additions, but says that it will "never be possible in this building or any remodeling or enlargement of it to secure efficiency and economy in any of the library's work." Rather than unwise compromises at a high cost, he urges a new building and gives reasonable standards for its size, book and reader capacity, and cost. He stresses particularly the importance of a good location, adding an appendix in which he quotes various authorities on this subject.

The chapter on administration includes a particularly interesting discussion on how the book collection was studied for obsolescence. The books on the shelves were checked to show their circulation during the previous five years. It was found that 30 per cent of the titles could be discarded with a loss of only 5 per cent in circulation. It was also shown that "a book that had not circulated in three years has less than

one chance in thirty to come to life again." Furthermore, it appeared that the reference use of periodicals "falls very heavily upon a few titles, and . . . concentrates very heavily upon the past ten years." These results have significance and interest for all librarians. The methods used in studying the book collection could be employed by many librarians to good advantage.

The section on technical processes, by Jesse H. Shera, accounts for about half the chapter on administration. It covers acquisitions, cataloging, and binding. It gives a chart on the number of books cataloged and lists the periodicals which are currently bound, showing which were and which were not used in the eight-week period of study. Mr. Shera recommends that all these processes be combined in a preparations department and urges that the cataloging system in the Gary Public Library be studied and adapted to Saginaw.

The chapter on library service to the schools is a shorter one. There is evidently little library service in the schools to describe. Miss Bennett outlines the "objectives and standards for school-library service" and recommends that the board of education assume full financial and administrative responsibility for books to all grades, instead of depending on the public library.

Looking to the future, the survey says that Saginaw should endeavor to become the center of a county or regional library, that it should start mobile service to the outlying districts of the city and its suburbs, and that the guiding policy for its third period of development "should be to take the library into the community and to integrate it in every way possible with the fabric of community life."

There is comparatively little in this survey about the personnel of the library, except for scattered references to the activities of different members and a few recommendations in regard to staff. Nor, apparently, were the surveyors called upon to make any study of the Hoyt Library building, which serves the west end of the city.

This document is recommended to librarians and library-board members as a valuable guide in making surveys of and checking the policies and practices in their own libraries.

LOLETA D. FVAN

Michigan State Library

"A Regional Library Service for the East Bay Area." Report of a Survey by JOSEPH L. WHEELER. Oakland, Calif.: East Bay Regional Library Committee, November, 1948. Pp. 68. (Planographed.) Distributed by courtesy of Oakland Public Library, 659 Fourteenth St., Oakland, Calif.

This report is one more example of the apparently boundless energy, clear thinking, and forthright speaking of a member of the library profession whose ability to accomplish his goals has been the envy of many of his professional colleagues ever since, in 1909, he completed in one year the difficult two-year postgraduate course for the B.L.S. at the old New York State Library School in Albany. The report itself is a thorough, keenly analytical, forward-looking, constructive, and outspoken document.

Section 1 states clearly the origin and purpose of the study. In 1947 five municipal and two county librarians in the East Bay area of California opposite San Francisco decided to explore the possibilities of better library service through some form of regional organization. The present survey resulted. In it such topics as "Population Background," "Present Library Situation and Its Weaknesses," and "What Is an Effective Regional Library System?" are carefully studied. The advantages and disadvantages of each of nine possible Bay districts for library service are then examined critically, and the six most important factors in a pattern for regional organization are enumerated as follows: (1) large overhead organization, (2) elimination of political-unit boundaries as service-area boundaries, (3) an over-all library support of \$2.00 per capita, of which \$0.50 shall be from state aid, (4) all personnel chosen for merit only, (5) continuation of local boards for local libraries in cities of over 10,000 (for the purpose of public relations), and (6) state aid based on adequate and assured, not arbitrary, local support.

The discussion of library regional organizations elsewhere is one of the several sections of the report that will prove of distinct value to other areas studying their own regional possibilities. The volume also contains an enlightening analysis of the pertinence to this library regional problem of similar regional studies of other services in California. It includes, furthermore, a study of two already established East Bay regional organizations which present certain parallels to the one proposed in the Wheeler survey.

The emerging recommendation, a partial compromise, is for a two-county region with five smaller district libraries. The necessary procedure is outlined in eight steps. These include the appointment of strong committees of informed, energetic, and sympathetic citizens representing different community organizations that are ready to work with and strengthen the faith of the librarians. On the East Bay librarians Mr. Wheeler places the heavy responsibility for leadership in this area of "almost unparalleled library potential."

The footnotes compiled at the end of the report present a select bibliography of the subject studied. The illustrative material included—charts, diagrams, statistics, etc.—are most effective. There is an excellent table of contents, though the lack of an index is regrettable. The printed cover is particularly attractive. The single-spaced planographed text tends to be a little tiring to the reader.

According to one on the ground who is profoundly interested in this study for reasons both professional and personal, its most significant aspects are: (a) it points up clearly the inadequacies of the California county-library system in providing a solution to the problem of library service to unincorporated areas surrounding some municipalities in the East Bay area; (b) it focuses attention on the East Bay as a *region* and has started librarians and library boards thinking in terms of regional service; (c) it emphasizes the weak financial position of many libraries; (d) it paints a clear picture of what could be accomplished under a good regional setup.

In the light of the limited time available for this study, the amount of data produced and carefully analyzed is extensive. The intent of the surveyor was to produce a practical document recommending a workable, if not ideal, plan in the face of the many complicated problems presented. He has succeeded well.

The spirit of co-operation and constructive "thinking together" which Dr. Wheeler initiated during his stay in California continues noticeably among the librarians of the area; another direct result of the survey is the committee set up by the California Library Association to explore the idea of adequate state aid for libraries.

A further development, quite possibly stimulated by the survey, is the appointment by the East Bay section of the California League of Municipalities of a strong committee on "Intergovernmental Relations." The objective of this

committee is to discover ways and means for better co-operation, better organization, and better financing. The Wheeler survey places the librarians in the foreground of this movement.

This reviewer, from his own acquaintance with the area concerned, heartily agrees with all that is said and implied regarding the obstacles to successful regional organization and administration, which are most frequently due to entrenched local authority (both professional and political), to self-centered (if not unqualified) administrators, and to indifference in high places.

Success here as elsewhere will require high standards, hard work, sacrifice, courage, co-operation, competent leadership, and loyal support. The East Bay has all these. United, they can make real this area's "almost unparalleled library potential."

JOHN BOYNTON KAISER

Newark Public Library

Reaching Readers: Techniques of Extending Library Services: Papers Presented at the Library Institute . . . June 26-27, 1947. Edited by CARLETON B. JOECKEL. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1949. Pp. 124. \$2.75.

The primary purpose of the Institute at which these papers were read was to present "a thoroughly practical description of the different kinds of service outlets in reaching readers" in large-unit public libraries.

The first three papers describe interesting criteria and techniques used in extending area-wide service by hospitals, banks, and public school systems. The remainder are case studies of individual libraries illustrating varying methods of reaching readers, including the branch in rural area, the metropolitan branch, the regional branch, the branch in the public schools, and the bookmobile. A paper on co-operation among independent and affiliated libraries and an interpretive summary of all the papers by the editor, complete the 120-page paper-bound book.

While the papers deal with techniques and methods, the reader and his interests, rather than mechanical efficiency, are paramount throughout. Naturally, most of the cases reported are superior libraries; those in California are of such size and have such financial support as

to seem astronomical to the average librarian. Imaginative adaptation, however, will make the techniques described useful in many other situations. Although the emphasis is on county organization and service, many of the devices are applicable in town and city libraries.

The influence of the trend in public administration toward centralization of authority and of essential services is apparent. With the *National Plan for Public Library Service and Reaching Readers*, library officials have general and specific patterns on which to draw for guidance in almost any known situation.

HELEN M. HARRIS

Lawson McGhee Library
Knoxville, Tennessee

The Task and Training of Librarians. By ERNEST J. REECE. New York: King's Crown Press, 1949. Pp. 91. \$1.75.

The report of this investigation is not to be read hastily. Only through careful analysis and weighing of the contents may all the implications of the author's theme be grasped. It is a broad theme: the preparation for professional work in American libraries. So much has been written on this subject during the last few years that many readers may shy away from just another contribution, be it brief or lengthy. One of the faults of the report is its brevity. Its horizons are limitless and its prose is packed with meat upon which librarians might chew for a long time; yet several of the topics have been dealt with inadequately, and the author has failed to produce solutions for all the problems. It is to be hoped that he or other competent thinkers may explore further some of the ideas presented here in embryonic form.

Planned as an aid to the faculty of the Columbia School of Library Service in revising its curriculum, the study is sufficiently objective to engage the attention of anyone interested in libraries and library education. The original design was to seek information by means of interviews, and a set of questions was mailed in advance to prospective consultants as a starting point for the conversations. Representative librarians were thus interviewed, other persons met in group conferences, and still others provided written suggestions. In all, two hundred individuals have contributed to the results of the investigation. The pattern and the conclusions

of the printed report, however, represent the thinking of the author.

A comparison of the questions, which are supplied in an appendix, with the Table of Contents may make one wonder if the author has not gone far afield in his text. The fact that statistics, graphs, and charts are entirely absent may create further doubts. Actually, the report works closely but unobtrusively within the findings. The result is not an edited version of the answers but an expository text concerned with a series of problems regarding which the consultants showed sharp differences of opinion. The author treats both questions and answers with fairness, evaluating the points by the logic and force of the answers, rather than by a tabulated count of the divergent opinions.

The entire report envisages libraries as they might develop in the future. Discussion of the prerequisite training for the staff members who will man such institutions is included. Chapter ii, "The Book and Beyond," stresses the point that libraries have not yet made full use of their possibilities for service and presents several examples of the ways in which librarians' responsibilities may change. The four succeeding chapters are devoted to the necessary intellectual and personal endowments of librarians; they include reports by consultants on some of the obvious shortcomings along these lines. Chapters vii-ix deal with the role of library schools and other educational agencies in training people for various levels of the profession. The final chapter is concerned with nonlibrary agencies that are allied to libraries in purpose and function and with the possibilities for enlarging the curriculums of library schools in order to meet the personnel needs of important nonlibrary units.

In the opinion of this reviewer, chapter ii is far superior to the rest of the study. With few changes this section might stand by itself as a prophetic essay on what librarianship could develop into, if libraries were to extend their services to meet the immediate and potential requirements of readers. Chapter ix, entitled "Sub-professional Training," presents a cross-section of current thought on training for the mass of librarians who are needed for various types of positions which may not warrant advanced graduate study. As might be expected, this is the subject about which consultants showed the widest disagreement. The author has struggled with the findings but has reached no clear-cut decisions. The final chapter, treating of nonlibrary agencies, should either have re-

ceived greater attention or have been eliminated altogether. It is suggestive but, at least in its present form, highly impractical.

Long professional association with the author will no doubt cause some librarians to scan these pages for evidence of his common-sense philosophy and dry humor. Such qualities are not apparent in all sections, but two quotations from chapter viii, devoted to improving the caliber of recruits for the profession, are highly characteristic. One comments on the point of view of the complaining student: "There can be no hope that an altered scheme of preparation would insure unalloyed satisfaction on the part of students—that is too much to expect in professional training." The other remark concludes a constructive discussion on the means of screening applicants to schools: "There is no royal formula for the selection of candidates, of course. No occupation can have a monopoly on able recruits, nor hope that all it attracts will prove outstanding."

HARRIET D. MACPHERSON

*Drexel Institute of Technology
Philadelphia, Pa.*

"Issues in Library Education: A Report of the Conference on Library Education, Princeton University, December 11th and 12th, 1948." Edited by HAROLD LANCOUR. Council of National Library Associations, 1949. Pp. ix+74. (Lithoprinted.) Distributed by Edwards Brothers, Inc., Ann Arbor, Mich.

During the last three years the ferment that has characterized education for librarianship has led to numerous meetings and conferences to discuss various aspects of the subject. "Issues in Library Education," the report of the Princeton conference, makes available and brings into single focus much which has been discussed in earlier meetings. It does not cover all matters pertaining to library education, nor does it answer all the questions on the agenda of the conference. But it reports much of the critical thinking with reference to education for librarianship that has been current during the postwar era. The participants unanimously adopted nine recommendations. The accomplishments of the conference, as well as the essence of the report, are in a sense distilled in these recommendations. How these differences of opinion were resolved, as developed in the editor's handling of the proceedings, is exceedingly interesting reading

and indicates clearly the thinking and the contribution of many of the participants.

The conference was attended by thirty-six persons representing sixteen of the accredited library schools, the Library of Congress, and the American Library Association. Among the participants were administrators from twelve university and four public libraries, as well as a librarian emeritus. With three exceptions, all were from cities east of the Mississippi.

Six main subjects formed the agenda of the Princeton conference, and these provide the framework within which the report is developed. Part I concerns the "Responsibility of Professional Organizations for Library Education." Here the discussion stresses the duplication of effort expended by organizations and agencies concerned with education for librarianship; it treats of the possibility of defining "spheres of interest" for groups such as the American Library Association, the Association of American Library Schools, the Division of Library Education, the Board of Education for Librarianship, etc. Recommendation 1, proposing a joint committee for the exchange of information *in re* library education, and Recommendation 2, extending the scope and activity of the Association of American Library Schools *News Letter*, were the capstone of the discussions on this topic.

Part II, "Recruiting for Librarianship," in addition to noting the usual suggestions for recruiting programs and procedures, summarizes recruiting activity to date at all levels and includes in its discussion an evaluative treatment of the various recruiting devices that have been used by one agency or another. Recommendation 3 grew out of the sessions relating to recruitment.

Part III, "Accreditation of Library Schools," carries some of the most significant discussions of the report. Accreditation versus nonaccreditation and national versus regional accreditation are two of the important topics of this portion of the work. Notwithstanding the criticism leveled at the Board of Education for Librarianship in these deliberations, the conferees agreed that the Board of Education should (1) be the official accrediting body and (2) assume positive leadership by giving advice and guidance to library schools. Recommendations 4 and 5 were developed out of the conferences on this topic. Some of the most lucid and logical statements made by delegates appear in this section.

Part IV, "Educating Librarians for the Several Types of Library Work," carries the edi-

tor's overview and summary comment as well as the conferees' discussion of the pros and cons of including extensive special (subject-area) library courses in library-school curriculums. In general, the conference tended to confirm Professor Ernest Reece's cogent statement made some time ago on this matter, and it resolved its discussions with Recommendation 6.

Part V, "Classification and Certification of Librarians," includes an account of certification practices in the United States. The principle of graded and scaled certification to the exclusion of a "single-standard" type of certification is emphasized. Discussions on this topic resulted in Recommendations 7 and 8. The former urges study by the Board of Education for Librarianship of various undergraduate programs in library education; the latter proposes that the American Library Association and the Council of National Library Associations investigate ways of subsidizing the Board of Education for Librarianship for the purpose of carrying on such a study.

Part VI, "Placement of Professional and Non-professional Library Workers," reports discussions relating to the past and present policies and activities of library schools in this area. Summarized also is the history of the American Library Association's placement program. Resulting from the discussions, Recommendation 9 calls for the recognition of the profession's obligation to provide placement service to its members and recommends that the American Library Association aid in carrying forward this object.

Considered as a whole, "Issues in Library Education" seems to be a faithful account of what must have been lively, provocative sessions. The report is lucid, balanced, and well written. Mr. Lancour has been judicious in his choice of direct quotations from the conferees and has succeeded in presenting a report which reads well. What appears to be a summarized editorial indictment of the Board of Education for Librarianship, in the closing paragraphs of Part V, is perhaps not essential to the report. It is also regrettable that apparently none of the participants made any reference to the American Public Library Inquiry and its attention to, and implications for, library education.

ROBERT L. GITLER

*School of Librarianship
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington*

Education for Librarianship: Papers Presented at the Library Conference, University of Chicago, August 16-21, 1948. Edited by BERNARD BERELSON. Chicago: American Library Association, 1949. Pp. vii+307. \$4.00.

A review might be expected to summarize the contents of a published volume. But this reviewer cannot hope to equal the perfection of the summary of the speakers' points of view offered by Dean Berelson in his Introduction to *Education for Librarianship*. Here Berelson takes the principal ideas, sets them forth clearly, and marshals them into a battery of constructive proposals, the value of which, he suggests, "can be tested during the reorientation of library education over the next years."

It is most opportune that the conferences on education for librarianship and on the Public Library Inquiry occurred so close together, for the Public Library Inquiry furnishes the justification for the educational programs projected in the discussions on education for librarianship. The fact that the Public Library Inquiry by definition is limited to public libraries does not prevent its reflecting hypotheses, philosophies, and functions which are pertinent to other types of library service. It is for such programs of service that personnel must be educated. The need for professional education can be more clearly defined because of the findings and pronouncements of the Public Library Inquiry.

But, even without the reports of the Public Library Inquiry, a turning point in the history of professional education for librarianship is apparent from the volume under consideration, because the concept of the library toward which the education is directed is based on a social rationale. The professional education of the past has been designed to fit its library as the clay case neatly fits its cuneiform tablet, i.e., to protect and to dignify it. The education which this volume signalizes is a creative thing, an ability to reach out and grasp the factors which produce human records and which provide the necessity for communication and, out of these factors, to construct an institution which will serve society in its need for intellectual well-being as the medical profession serves the need for health.

It is disturbing that the most valuable critical perspective on our problems comes from scholars *outside* the ranks of librarians. Tyler clearly defines professional education in terms of "characteristics of a true profession." A mature profession, he says, "not only develops members

who carry on their work through principles other than rule of thumb, but . . . also encourages its members to gain an understanding of these principles in a much larger context than that afforded by the usual confines of the occupation."

Faust makes clear the nature and desirability of the general (liberal) education upon which professional education for librarianship must rest if it is to produce librarians who can devise the proper ways for "reaching the truth." What the professional schools "may properly insist upon," he says, is that candidates "should come to them able to read, to write, to reckon, to think straight and to have a philosophical grasp of social and personal problems."

Colwell, in emphasizing the desirability of productive research in the field by which the profession can "associate with humanists and social scientists in the pursuit of further knowledge" and "can provide self-criticism of the most searching sort," puts a finger on one of the greatest needs in the profession. Berelson's contribution on advanced study and research in librarianship points up sharply the characteristics of the research needed and warns against a confusion between an advanced degree and sound advanced study or research.

The remaining papers are devoted more narrowly to the relation of education to practice, to summaries of facts regarding existing programs, and to deliberations about appropriate curriculums for given responsibilities.

The ideas and suggestions in this volume are the most important in any of the institute programs sponsored by the Graduate Library School up to 1949. They reflect the twenty-five-year growth in our point of view since the pronouncements of the Williamson report of 1923 and of Learned's *The American Public Library and the Diffusion of Knowledge*, a growth which was stimulated by Butler's *An Introduction to Library Science*.

Education for Librarianship and the reports of the Public Library Inquiry should be studied together. They should be taken to heart by all persons concerned about professional education for librarianship and should be used by library-school faculties as bases for evaluating their curriculums.

ETHEL M. FAIR

Library School
New Jersey College for Women
Rutgers University

Spade-Work: The Story of Thomas Greenwood.

By GRACE CARLTON. London: Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., 1949. Pp. 176. 10s. 6d.

With H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh as president-designate of the Library Association, British librarians are busily preparing to celebrate next year the centenary of the passing of the first British Public Libraries Act. The time is ripe for study and assessment of the past, and Miss Grace Carlton has chosen her moment well for the publication of her biography of Thomas Greenwood, a man who exercised great influence in the development of the public library movement in his day.

In spite of the high place which he occupies in British library history, little has hitherto been written about this "apostle of the library movement"; and, though Miss Carlton works very hard to make amends for previous neglect, the picture she presents of Greenwood remains shadowy, leaving the reader with a sense of frustration and incompleteness. This is not altogether the fault of the author. As she points out in her Introduction, Greenwood left little record of himself—no personal letters, neither diary nor notebook—and her meager source material consisted of "a chance interview, a few newspaper cuttings and some letters from people well known in his day." Miss Carlton has done her best to supplement these from a wide variety of sources mentioned in a list of acknowledgments and has, one judges, received assistance from the Greenwood family; and yet she has failed to make her portrait come alive, and the reader will share the regret she expresses on several occasions at the burning by Greenwood of a packing case of personal records which would have made her task much easier.

The known facts about Greenwood are presented faithfully against the social background of his period, though it is unfortunate that, at times, paucity of information forces the author to embroider the background to the detriment of the main theme. A frequent and rather irritating use of the conjectural "would" creates an impression of uncertainty in the narrative, as when we are told that "as a little lad he would wander in those grey-green fields," or "Greenwood, accustomed to Lancashire squalor, would nevertheless look down in dismay as his train ran into Sheffield," or "a visit to Niagara would be the traveller's first consideration."

Miss Carlton's literary style tends to be flowery, with occasional lapses into obscurity and a leaning toward extravagance in allusion. It is,

for instance, somewhat bizarre to write of the year of Greenwood's birth: "That year of Grace 1851 would appear to contemporaries as inauspicious for the world as might his harsh personal circumstances seem to this frail infant." In spite of the handicap of such flights of fancy, the story of Thomas Greenwood emerges through the scanty records of his childhood, the adventure of his youth and early manhood, the success of his business enterprises as the publisher of trade journals, to his death, in 1908, while still in his prime.

Several threads are woven into the story. First, there is the character of the man reared in a hard school, with strong liberal principles, industrious, shrewd, and kindly, a typical Victorian whose ability and hard work gained him a respected position of moderate affluence; second, his domestic life, pictured mostly as happy and exemplary, but with occasional hints of friction and estrangement and loneliness which, in the absence of any specific cause in the story itself, are somewhat bewildering; third, Greenwood the author, dealt with faithfully and in considerable detail but holding little of interest for the present-day reader, though his writings on libraries retain historical importance.

Finally, there is the cause to which Greenwood devoted so much of his time and energies. In his championship of libraries lies his claim to remembrance, and this biography should be judged by its success as a contribution to the history of libraries. It is in this respect, however, that it most signally falls short. Miss Carlton fails to capture the spirit of the crusade in which her hero was engaged, and Greenwood's work for the establishment of public libraries has an almost casual part in the story. Her frequent comparison of the apostle of the library movement with the Apostle Paul seems unwarranted in the absence of any thrilling incident like the conversion on the road to Damascus. This is a pity, for Greenwood was a crusader.

It would be unfortunate if the literary shortcomings and the excess of rather dull padding in this biography should lead to its neglect by those who have reaped the benefit of Greenwood's labors.

WILLIAM B. PATON

Scottish School of Librarianship
Glasgow

The Supply of Foreign Books and Periodicals to the Libraries of the United Kingdom: Report of

a *Survey Made under the Auspices of the Rockefeller Foundation*. By MARJORIE PLANT. London: Library Association, 1949. Pp. 60. 2s. 6d. (2s. to members of the [British] Library Association.)

"There has for some time," says the author of this report, "been a feeling of uncertainty among university librarians and others [of the United Kingdom] as to whether the learned and scientific publications of other countries are being adequately represented on their shelves." Some librarians, it appears, were inclined to place the blame on the local booksellers, others on the lack of reliable bibliographies or other sources of information, while many were irritated by the import restrictions of the Board of Trade. To get at the truth of the matter, this survey was launched under the auspices of the University and Research Section of the Library Association with the assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation and was completed in December, 1948, in the short space of seven months.

Dr. Plant's report will inevitably remind the reader of the surveys which preceded the inauguration of the Farmington Plan.¹ But it is both less and more than they. The objective of Metcalf and Williams was to ascertain the facts of a situation similar to that which was under survey here (i.e., the adequacy for research purposes of the acquisition of foreign books by American libraries), with a view to improving the situation through widespread co-operative effort. Their reports demonstrated the logic of the Farmington Plan so effectively as to lead to its adoption, being otherwise of little more than statistical interest. Dr. Plant's purpose, on the other hand, was "to produce any information [she] could which would be both relevant and helpful"; and if her findings fail to result in an irresistible program of action, she has at least succeeded in assembling the kind of data she was seeking. Her compilation, because of the very practical information and suggestions which it contains, should be of use to acquisitions librarians not only in the British Isles but everywhere.

From the statistics on foreign book acquisitions by British libraries we learn that between 1938 and 1947 there was a decline of 31 per cent

¹ Keyes D. Metcalf and Edwin E. Williams, "Proposal for a Division of Responsibility among American Libraries in the Acquisition and Recording of Library Materials," *College and Research Libraries*, V (1944), 105-9; Williams, "Research Library Acquisitions from Eight Countries," *Library Quarterly*, XV (1945), 313-23.

in the gross weight of foreign books imported into the United Kingdom. (The weight of imports from the United States, specifically, declined 57 per cent in that time.) During the same period, however, foreign acquisitions in a representative group of thirty university, college, special, and public libraries (omitting the British Museum) increased 43 per cent, with accessions of United States books alone increasing 124 per cent. The statistical tables show not only the totals of foreign book accessions in a larger group of 130 libraries but also the distribution of these accessions by country of origin, category of publication, and type of library. The American publications accessioned in these libraries in 1947 were nearly three times the number of French publications, which came next in order of frequency. Though it was not generally possible to distinguish separate titles among the total receipts of the 130 libraries, the author concludes, for example, that the total intake of books by these libraries from all eleven countries of the South American continent during 1947 amounted to only 96 individual books and pamphlets and 66 nonserial government reports, while the probable figures for periodicals and government serials from the same source were 146 and 181, respectively. Appalling as this figure is, there are others still more remarkable: 61 books and pamphlets received from China and 13 from Japan in 1947; not a single nonserial government report from Hungary and only 3 reports each from Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, and Yugoslavia during the same period. It should be stated, however, that the table of total accessions does not include the nonpurchase receipts of the British Museum; nor is it clear to what extent the table comprehends the accessions of other principal libraries, such as the Bodleian; these are faults in the presentation.

The most surprising thing of all is that, having assembled a mass of data possessing some startling characteristics, the author fails to draw conclusions from them. Instead, she has proceeded to lay a completely new basis for her recommendations. She reports the results of an inquiry into the number of libraries in the United Kingdom which are not satisfied with their receipts of foreign books, and the causes for their dissatisfaction. It was found that, out of 236 responding libraries, 114 were satisfied with their foreign acquisitions, while 122, or slightly more than half, felt the need of additional material. Fifty-one librarians cited lack of funds as an impediment, while 89 (including some of the 51)

complained of not knowing what to order.

It is to satisfying the latter class of complaint that two-thirds of the report are devoted. Among the correctives suggested are (1) the "blanket" order, (2) exchange of accession lists of foreign books among librarians of the United Kingdom, (3) "organized specialization" along the lines of the Farmington Plan, (4) selective purchases based on recommendations of foreign librarians, and (5) exhibitions of foreign works. "Organized specialization" is passed over lightly with the citation of a few co-operative arrangements, of which the most notable is the specialization in foreign works of a literary character by the members of the East Midlands Regional Library System. We are informed, however, that the Library Association is making plans for a survey which may provide the basis for more widespread arrangements.

More recently, a working party on library and information services of the Library Research Committee of the Library Association, to which was assigned the job of following up the recommendations of the Royal Society's Scientific Information Conference of June-July, 1948, has produced a "Report on the Co-operative Provision of Books, Periodicals and Related Material in Libraries," which outlines a basic plan for a library service in Britain based on the premise that "all useful books, periodicals and related materials should be freely available to all who require them." This plan involves the use of the national libraries, first- and second-line special libraries, regional reference libraries, and other lending libraries. The working party's report was made available in this country as an appendix to the *Library of Congress Information Bulletin* for November 8-14, 1949.

Part II of the report consists of a series of "regional notes" likely to be useful to a very wide group of librarians, indicating, country by country, the current (1948) state of publishing, important sources of information regarding new publications, and the names of foreign libraries which are willing to provide copies of their accession lists with indications of the most important items. Supplemental information provided by the appendix includes lists of British libraries willing to furnish a similar service and also a list of foreign publishing houses.

VERNER W. CLAPP

Library of Congress

American and Canadian Libraries: Some Notes on a Visit in the Summer of 1947. By J. H. P. PAFFORD. London: Library Association, 1949. Pp. vi+42. 4s.; 3s. to members of the Library Association.

It is a good and salutary experience for librarians on this American continent to receive visits from transatlantic librarians, particularly when these are men of wide experience, broad sympathies, and high professional ideals. In the past few years, thanks to the policy of the American Library Association and its generous support by the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation, we have benefited to no small degree from the opportunity of meeting these distinguished men—among them Tisserant, Kenyon, Cowley, and many others—and of discussing with them common problems and local differences.

One of the latest of these visitors was Mr. J. H. P. Pafford, Goldsmiths' Librarian of the University of London, who, in the summer of 1947, under the auspices of the American Library Association and the Rockefeller Foundation, visited eighty-six libraries in Canada and the United States and embodied the results of his arduous travel, visits, and conversations in this forty-two-page pamphlet now issued by the Library Association, London.

Roughly one-third of the report is devoted to university libraries, their equipment and administration; another, to the various aspects of service to readers; and the final third to library training and co-operation, though the author is by no means sure which aspect of American librarianship is the most important.

He is doubtless right in thinking that more attention should be paid to the content of college courses and to the quality of graduate work and that improvement in these would have a salutary effect upon university-library holdings and service. The comparative paucity of bibliographies prepared by library staff members is noticed, and the implication is obvious: Here is a rich field which the professionally qualified are neglecting. There is also on the American continent a tendency to the overdoing of committee meetings and conferences, where occasionally the printed menu promises more professional nourishment than the feast provides.

Mr. Pafford questions whether the development of cheap "warehouse" depository libraries for regional service will not in the long run prove less satisfactory than would additions to the stacks of existing libraries for the same purpose.

The use of microfilms and microcards as an alternative form of library record receives some attention, but it is noted that the extended use of this type of material will depend upon the construction of adequate reading apparatus, which is still in the experimental stage.

Mr. Pafford seems to regard readers' aids, notices, exhibits, and browsing rooms as a kind of lure to attract students to the library, rather overdone in the eyes of one who is more familiar with the less coerced students of British universities; and he notices the pride which American librarians take in "gadgets," and the general "cheeriness, keenness, and industry" of library staffs, which are usually 50 per cent larger in numbers than in British libraries and have perhaps, as a result, more time to be optimistic.

The problems of library training, which have exercised the profession formally more widely and for a longer time in America than in Britain, are reviewed (pp. 23-28), and some of the deficiencies and contradictions of our present methods of training are noted.

This survey of American and Canadian libraries, though necessarily brief, is by no means superficial, and its careful study will do much to alleviate our professional myopia and help us to see ourselves as others see us, for the librarians' middle name should never be Narcissus.

G. R. LOMER

McGill University Library

Livre et document: Études sur le livre, les bibliothèques et la documentation. Edited by GEORGETTE DE GROLIER. ("Editions de la *Revue du livre et des bibliothèques*.") Saint-Cloud, 1943. Pp. 94.

Since new publications in the field of French librarianship are now relatively rare, this little brochure merits some attention. It appears that, through lack of a strong central publishing agency for library studies in France, the comparatively thin product of an ambitious few can be published virtually privately and still make some claim to representing French librarianship today. This little book gives the impression, by its format, of being one in a series; but, so far as this writer has been able to determine, it stands alone, with no antecedents and no subsequent issues.

The volume in hand is composed of a series of papers, chiefly of limited length and scope.

Some of the authors are well-known names, but the majority are not to be found elsewhere in our literature. Following the numbered pages dedicated to the papers is a twelve-page brochure devoted exclusively to advertising the services of the Bureau bibliographique de France, which leaves this reviewer with the general impression that the publication as a whole was designed to carry the advertising. The above named Bureau is apparently staffed by the editor of this collection, who is the public librarian of the town of Boulogne-Villancourt, and one Eric de Grolier, another member of the family. This impression is not lessened by even a cursory examination of the book, which reveals that forty-eight of the ninety-four numbered pages are devoted to long articles by Eric de Grolier and Georgette de Grolier.

The three long articles which comprise the significant part of this little book are of interest chiefly to those concerned with the development of the public library. Since public libraries in France are, like their schools, largely nationalized, the first long article by M. Ernest Coyecque, "Les Bibliothèques municipales de Paris: Étude d'administration réaliste," is particularly apt. The author is deadly earnest, and the picture he draws of some fifty years of work within the serried ranks of civil servants of the Paris public library system is as entertaining as it is illuminating. A detailed picture of internecine warfare among the "archivistes," "paléographes," and simple "petits-fonctionnaires" would be ludicrous, were it not for the seriousness of the results. This article outlines in detail the kinds of training and qualities now found in, or felt to be desirable for, library personnel in the public libraries of France. Other aspects of public librarianship are taken up in turn, with a pungent directness of criticism seldom found in our literature. M. Coyecque, as the "inspecteur honoraire des bibliothèques de la ville de Paris et du département de la Seine," completes his work by proposing *seriatim* exactly how he thinks a municipal library system should be organized and challenging the administration to carry out his suggestions. Biased or bitter though it may be, this is undoubtedly one of the most detailed pictures of the organization of the Paris public libraries ever written, and it should serve students well.

The second and longest article of this group, by Eric de Grolier, is entitled "Une Politique nationale du livre et de la documentation." It

continues the field of the previous article, expanding it to a national scale and concentrating more on services than on personnel. The author takes up, in turn, the sources of publications, documentation, archives, and libraries. The most useful part of the article is the extensive report on public libraries, accompanied by tables, graphs, and sketch maps, showing the growth of libraries, numbers of inhabitants served, size of libraries, size of budgets, loans, and many other measures which can be compared with now universally applied methods of determining levels of library service. The survey includes academic libraries and special libraries and illustrates graphically the geographic concentrations of library service throughout France. This is a survey on two planes, one historic and the other contemporary, and the author gently notes the significant differences between library service in the United States and elsewhere as compared with France. The survey follows closely the pattern of Carleton Joeckel's work in this field and represents a notable contribution to our knowledge of French libraries.

The remaining articles in this volume are of minor interest only. A fairly long article by Georgette de Grolier on display in public libraries adds little to the quality of the book. The black-and-white illustrations are poorly reproduced in printing and represent rather primitive efforts at best. There are short pieces on Aslib, on photomicrography, on wartime publishing in Great Britain, on the Children's Book Council; but none of these is of great import.

The collection, as indicated above, contains some material of high quality. It is unfortunate, in the eyes of the reviewer, that these valuable essays are surrounded by a heterogeneous group of ephemeral and commercial matter. Nonetheless, the work remains important for its two notable studies, one local and one national, and it should serve students of the libraries of France for many years to come.

JERROLD ORNE

Washington University Libraries

Ergebnisse und Fortschritte der Bibliographie in Deutschland seit dem ersten Weltkrieg. By JORIS VORSTIUS. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1948. Pp. 172.

This summing-up of developments in German bibliography since World War I by Dr. Vorstius, professor of library science at the

University of Berlin and editor of the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, has the twofold distinction of being the first treatise on this subject to be published and the most noteworthy contribution to the literature of library science which has come from Europe since the close of World War II. Covering, as it does, the period immediately subsequent to Schneider's definitive *Handbuch der Bibliographie*, it will prove an indispensable supplementary guide to German bibliography.

The work is divided into two main sections. The first, devoted to general problems of bibliographical theory and practice, discusses basic principles, originators of bibliographies, production of bibliographies, relationships to international bibliography, documentation, and standardization. The second and major section is a comprehensive analysis of progress in the following individual fields: international bibliography; national bibliography; personal bibliography; regional bibliography; subject bibliography; language and literature; history and folklore; philosophy, education, and religion; art and music; law, politics, and economics; general science; mathematics; inorganic sciences; organic sciences; medicine; technology; agriculture and forestry. The Index is regrettably meager, providing only one entry, either by author or by title, for each work cited. A listing by both author and title would have facilitated greatly the frequent reference to this volume which will be made by those seeking the latest available survey of German bibliography in all fields.

Dr. Vorstius sketches the ebb and flow of German bibliographical achievement against a background of economic and political vicissitudes. Recovering slowly from the disastrous effects of World War I and the inflation which followed it, bibliography was not fully revived in Germany until about 1924. Reaching its height in the late twenties and early thirties, German bibliography reflected the co-operative, internationalist spirit of the reconstruction era in its enthusiastic participation in international bibliographical activities such as those of the League of Nations Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and the International Bibliographical Institute in Brussels. This period saw the production of such famous German contributions to international bibliography as the second edition of the *Index bibliographicus*, the *Internationale Bibliographie der Geschichtswissenschaft*, the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, the

Deutscher Gesamtkatalog, the Internationale Bibliographie des Buch- und Bibliothekswesens, and the Internationaler Jahresbericht der Bibliographie.

With the coming of the National Socialist era in 1933, German bibliography experienced an initial stimulus, owing to the high degree of centralization in all phases of national life, but suffered in the long run from the ever increasing isolation of National Socialist Germany from the rest of the world. No longer permitted participation in the work of international organizations, and denied free intercourse with foreign scholarship, German bibliography had already begun to lose ground, especially in nonscientific fields, before its disruption once again in the holocaust of war.

Although the history of German bibliographical achievement during the last three decades has been one of unequal advances in various fields rather than a record of planned progress on all fronts, Dr. Vorstius, in reviewing the bibliographical field as a whole, finds a considerable gain in prestige and performance. The most profoundly significant development in German bibliography during this century of faction and strife has been the steadily increasing acceptance of the conviction that bibliography, an activity vital to intellectual life, cannot thrive without conference and co-operation among men and nations.

LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON

University of Kentucky Library

Die Sachkatalogisierung in den wissenschaftlichen Allgemeinbibliotheken Deutschlands.

By JORIS VORSTIUS. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1948. Pp. viii + 58.

The techniques of the subject approach to the holdings of German research libraries differ considerably from Anglo-American practice. For example, the only library in Germany which has a dictionary catalog is the Augsburg Stadtbibliothek, and the alphabetical subject catalog (*Schlagwortkatalog*) is really an innovation which began to catch on only after World War I. The classed catalog (*Realkatalog* or *systematischer Katalog*¹), often serving simultaneously as

a shelf list, has been the main channel of approach to the subject matter of German research libraries for the last two centuries.

In the twentieth century the classed catalog has been subjected to a rather careful re-examination with respect to both practice and theory. Most striking from our standpoint has been the criticism of its dual role as a shelf list and a key to the subject matter of the collections ("systematischer Katalog mit Standortbindung"). As a result, relatively few German research libraries are still bound to the "Dogma der systematischen Aufstellung" (phrase coined by Georg Leyh in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, XXIX [1912], 241-59, and XXX [1913], 97-136); the majority have gone over to some more or less arbitrary system of shelving ("mechanische Aufstellung"). But theoretical review of the structure of the classed catalog itself has also been fruitful, and qualitative improvements have been effected in many libraries.

Vorstius lists the libraries which have each type of catalog and gives pertinent historical notes. Purposes, theories, and rules are discussed in considerable detail with references to the extensive German literature in this field. Comparing the two types of subject catalogs, he rejects the notion that a library should select one or the other, pointing out that each catalog performs a different function. However, the alphabetical subject catalog has suffered whenever a choice has been made. In view of its greater elasticity and handiness, the alphabetical subject catalog receives the indorsement of the author, who argues that every research library should have one, even though reorganization of cataloging functions is necessary in order to construct and maintain it.

Vorstius' study, although brief, is well organized and makes a rational presentation of the situation in the German research libraries. It throws subject cataloging into a historical perspective that we in America are only now beginning to acquire. At the same time, Vorstius points the way for future planning, an essential to proper reconstruction of the German research library system.

LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON

University of Kentucky Library

¹ The terminology is confusing. The *Realkatalog* is also known as *Fachkatalog*, *Sachkatalog*, and *wissenschaftlicher Katalog*. However, in the early part of

the nineteenth century the alphabetical subject catalog was called the *Realkatalog*.

Introduction to Reference Books. By A. D. ROBERTS, F.L.A. London: Library Association (Chaucer House, Malet Place, W.C.1.), 1948. Pp. viii + 181. 12s.

Based on the author's lectures in the School of Librarianship, University College, London, this volume aims "to serve as an adequate guide to those general works of reference which a British library student may be expected to know."

The opening chapter defines reference books, describes types of reference libraries, and evaluates the literature of reference, including the British forerunners by Cowley, McColvin, and Esdaile and some American, German, and French counterparts. Eleven successive chapters then review selected reference sources by type in relation to inquiries. A final chapter, "Dealing with More Difficult Enquiries," outlines a procedure for reference work.

Having myself just completed the manuscript for the third edition of an American counterpart, I found the *Introduction* stimulating. Every page carried on it those burdens of decision affecting selection and sequence that every reference teacher knows so well from experience. In my opinion, Mr. Roberts has in most cases decided exceedingly well, and I know he will recognize the habits of the teacher in some of the questions here raised.

Many reference teachers prefer to begin their introduction to reference books with dictionaries; others start with bibliographies; a few lead off with biographies. Mr. Roberts favors the teachers who introduce reference books with encyclopedias. There is much to be said for that beginning, because recent studies of the sources used in answering reference questions show encyclopedias leading all the rest.

Mr. Roberts then introduces his students successively to dictionaries; newspapers and other records of current events, including year-books; directories and other business publications; bibliographies; serials; bibliographies of in-print and recent books; bibliographies of older British books; directories of societies and institutions and bibliographies of their publications; government publications; atlases and maps. An "Addenda, 1948" following the chapter on "Difficult Enquiries" completes the text.

Reference teachers will question certain sequence decisions: the separation, for example, of newspapers and recent events sources (chap. iv) from serials (chap. vii), especially since the latter chapter also has some discussion on the ori-

gin of newspapers. Similarly, some teachers will not want directories (chap. v), although related primarily to business, to be treated separately from directories of societies (chap. x). Most teachers will favor an earlier treatment of atlases and maps (here next to the last chapter) and an uninterrupted study of bibliographies (chaps. vi, viii, ix).

But Mr. Roberts is likely to find teachers objecting most of all to what appears to be a slight to biography reference sources. Study after study of reference questions in American libraries has shown biographical inquiries to be so frequent that special attention to biographical reference sources and early placement have been deemed essential in any beginning reference course. There is no separate chapter on biography in Mr. Roberts' book, though there is frequent reference to that category.

The section on reference reviews favors foreign-language titles perhaps a little more than the beginning American reference course calls for and omits such significant American current reviews as *Subscription Books Bulletin* and *Current Reference Books*. There is a good chapter on encyclopedias, including a clear, compact distinction between long- and short-article patterns, a readable history, and an understanding discrimination between the academic and the popular concept. The school encyclopedia, however, which has introduced so many pattern innovations and of which there are good British examples, is not mentioned at all.

Good methodology, employed throughout, is especially concentrated in the first and last chapters. After nearly twenty years of teaching reference work I am inclined to agree that some students can and some cannot take their methodology in terms of general principles. For those who cannot, these chapters read like "how to become a detective in six lessons." But for those who can, they will be packed with ideas for a variety of real reference situations.

There will be the usual criticisms of "inaccuracies" from reference workers plying their trade. Some of these will be the mention of typographical errors like C. Fordman for Fadiman (p. 29), and others will be objections to listing the *New International Encyclopedia* (p. 24) as one of "two other modern encyclopedias published in the United States." Still other criticisms will be based on "fixes" which we teachers develop as we teach our classes year after year, and no doubt this review has already exemplified that.

But the over-all impression of Mr. Roberts' book is favorable. Solid work has gone into the selection and description of titles and much thought into relating sources to reference situations. Although intended primarily for British library-school students, American reference workers will find *Introduction to Reference Books* worthy of careful reading.

LOUIS SHORES

Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

"North Texas Regional Union List of Serials: Comprising the Libraries of North Texas State Teachers College, Southern Methodist University, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Texas Christian University, Texas State College for Women, and the Public Libraries of Dallas and Fort Worth." Edited by ARTHUR M. SAMPLEY and LOUISE EVANS. Rev. ed. Denton, Tex.: North Texas State Teachers College, August 1, 1948. Pp. xvi+772. (Mimeographed.)

The present revision of the "North Texas Regional Union List of Serials" can be regarded as "another union list" extending the record of the serials holdings of American libraries as shown in the national *Union List of Serials*; in addition, it may be considered as a document presenting the partial history of a venture in regional library co-operation.

The significant steps in the history of the project, as outlined by Arthur M. Sampley in the Introduction, include a survey of the resources of the libraries of the region, conducted co-operatively, as a preliminary to the decision to make and maintain a union list of serials; the construction of a master card file showing serials holdings of the participating libraries; the publication of the first edition of the "North Texas Regional Union List of Serials" (1943) and two supplements; the compilation of a master-list of serials desiderata for the region, with assignment of single titles to the appropriate co-operating libraries; and the systematic effort, by each participating library, to fill in gaps shown by the survey. Among the results of these efforts, as shown by the tables in the Introduction, are (1) an increase in titles held, ranging from 49 per cent (for incomplete files) to 85 per cent (for complete and current files)—and with it, despite the declared purpose of eliminating duplication, a

slight increase in the percentage of titles held by more than one participating library—and (2) an increase in interlibrary co-operation in the use of resources and (incidentally) interchange of library privileges between two of the participating institutions. It seems safe to assume that as a project in library co-operation the "North Texas Regional Union List of Serials" has come reasonably close to the goal set for it. It is not so clear how useful it may be to libraries in general.

For general reference use, the value of a local union list of serials depends chiefly upon (1) the number of new libraries it adds to those already represented in union lists and (2) the new titles and other bibliographical information it adds to what is already on record. In so far as it duplicates existing information, it is pure waste.

In this respect, the "North Texas List" may prove disappointing. Three of the libraries, to be sure, are not included in the second edition of the general "Union List of Serials"; and the practice of breaking down holdings by issue (for incomplete volumes) for serials appearing not more than once a month represents a contribution in exactness of information. In general, however, the excellent pattern of the Gregory *Union List* has been followed so faithfully that an enormous amount of the material in this volume is of value only for purposes of interlibrary loan. Selection has been made, on the whole, without deviation from the criteria established by Gregory. An exception has been made, fortunately, for certain local material, for which the list becomes a valuable reference tool. An excellent example is the section, running to several pages, which is devoted to serials issued by various local Baptist organizations in Texas. Similarly, newspapers have been included wherever they are important for the region. Federal documents, however, and even Texas documents (with some exceptions), have generally been omitted.

Notwithstanding such omissions, the total bulk of the volume is formidable, running to nearly eight hundred leaves, and makes the material almost as awkward to handle as the original edition of Gregory. Much space is consumed by the repetition of all the standard Gregory notes and references; for the user outside Texas, of course, all this information is available more conveniently elsewhere. Another explanation for the size of the book is the necessity of reproducing typewritten copy. De-

spite evidence of painstaking care in an elaborate undertaking, errors can be found; and the substitution of clumsy typewritten approximations for the plus sign and the parallel verticals of Gregory makes a rather unpleasant page. Evidently because of the use of typewriting instead of print, accents are freely omitted, with such results as "Universite" and "Beiblatter."

As a local record and a tool for interlibrary loan, this list is admirable; as a bibliographical source, it will have only limited usefulness outside the area of immediate concern.

ROBERT W. WADSWORTH

University of Chicago Library

Author Headings for the Official Publications of the State of Louisiana. By LUCY B. FOOTE. Chicago: American Library Association, 1948. Pp. x+125. \$4.50.

This list of the author headings of the governmental departments, bureaus, boards, and other agencies of the territory and state of Louisiana is the second in the series of state headings, a project initiated several years ago by the Special Committee on Author Headings of the ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification. It is based on two earlier compilations by Miss Foote, the first, a Master's thesis at the University of Illinois in 1935, entitled "Official Publications of the State of Louisiana," and the second, entitled *Bibliography of the Official Publications of Louisiana, 1803-1934*, published in 1942. Considerable additional research was needed to verify and correct entries in the earlier lists and to extend the listing through 1947. That the task was not a simple one is suggested by what the compiler terms "complicating elements." Among these she lists the bilingual requirements existing from 1803 to 1864; the institutions peculiar to the state under a government based upon French civil law rather than upon common law—the origin of other state governments; repeated reorganizations of the state government effected by each of ten constitutions which were adopted in the course of the state's history; and, in recent years, attacks upon the constitutionality of the reorganization acts of 1940.

In addition to the author headings of official agencies as found in the law (April, 1803, to December, 1947) the list includes a good many semiofficial agencies and some private institu-

tions—the latter either because of partial support by state funds or because their reports to the legislature were published as state documents. Included also are some twenty entries for the territory of Orleans, the portion of the Louisiana Purchase incorporated in the present state of Louisiana. The name of each agency is given in the form found in the law creating it, and, whenever possible, reference is made to the specific section of the enabling act authorizing the name. Contained in the note following a high percentage of the headings is a brief history of the agency with date of establishment and abolition, mergers, changes of names, etc., and "See also" references to related agencies.

In conformity with the rules set up by the Special Committee on State Author Headings, an alphabetical arrangement under direct form of entry has been employed, author entries are given in capital letters, and "See" references in lower case. A particularly helpful feature is the generous use of cross-references from variant forms of a name, the catchword part of a heading, and the topical grouping of related entries under such captions as "Experiment Stations," "Hospitals," and "Trade Schools." Subdivisions of a department are listed under the name of the department and in some cases also as cross-references under the name of the division itself. Thus, the "Board of Finance," a division in the "Department of Finance," is found listed in its alphabetical place in the divisions under "LOUISIANA. DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE" and also as a cross-reference to the department under "Louisiana. Board of Finance."

The list contains approximately 825 author entries, both current and obsolete, and half again as many cross-references. Of the total number of author headings, slightly over 15.5 per cent are found in identical form in the *Library of Congress Catalog of Printed Cards*. An additional thirty or so headings found in the LC list are given as cross-references in the Louisiana list and about half-a-dozen cross-references in LC as entry headings in the present list. The above comparison gives some indication of the relative amount of help that librarians and others working with Louisiana state documents may, at the present time, expect to receive from the two sources of information.

Examination of the discrepancies in form of entry name as given in the LC catalog and the Louisiana list well illustrates the hazards of attempting to establish the entry for govern-

ment publications solely from the publications themselves. It reveals, further, that the compiler has in a number of instances interpreted the ALA rule to enter an agency under its latest name in the same way that Miss Markley did in the Alabama list. For example, under the heading "LOUISIANA. LEGISLATURE" is found this note: "Until 1921, this body was known as the General Assembly, but under Art. III, Constitution 1921, sec. 1, it became known as the Legislature of the state of Louisiana." Despite the fact that from 1812 until 1921 the official name of this body was "General Assembly," not "Legislature," the former name is used only as a cross-reference and not as an entry heading.

In the same way "LOUISIANA. STATE LIBRARY, BATON ROUGE" is given as the entry name, and a cross-reference is made from "Louisiana. Library Commission," even though the latter was apparently the official name of this agency from the time of its creation in 1920 until 1946, when it was changed to "Louisiana State Library." A similar, though less understandable, entry is found under "LOUISIANA. UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA, NEW ORLEANS." Here the note reads: "By Articles 137 and 138, Constitution 1845, the University of Louisiana in New Orleans was created. . . . By Act 43, 1884 this institution became known as Tulane University of Louisiana." With the expectation, then, that for publications after 1884 the entry would be under Tulane University, one is somewhat baffled to find only a reference reading, "Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans. See LOUISIANA. UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA, NEW ORLEANS."

Entry under the latest name with reference from earlier forms has, therefore, not been consistently followed. Another example is found in the entries for the "State Department of Education" and the "Department of Education." Here both forms of the name have been used as author headings, and the relationship between the two is indicated in a note. A "See also" reference under each ties up the two headings. This would seem to be the most logical and practical solution of the problem.

The above criticism of relatively minor points is not intended to minimize the importance of the present list or to detract from its value as a reference tool. The question of interpretation of this basic rule of entry has been raised solely to suggest that agreement on this point among compilers of other state lists

would undoubtedly increase the usefulness of future compilations in the series.

The Louisiana list is clearly the result of intelligent planning, long and painstaking research, and skilful execution. As an authoritative source of information for the cataloger and the bibliographer working with Louisiana state documents it will have inestimable value; and as a step forward in the bibliographic control of state publications it represents a significant achievement. It is to be hoped that compilers of succeeding lists will be able to maintain the high standards of workmanship exemplified in the first two publications in the series.

ROBERT R. DOUGLASS

Library School
University of Texas

Public Administration Libraries: A Manual of Practice. Prepared by the COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE GROUP OF THE SPECIAL LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION. ("Public Administration Service Publications," No. 102.) Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1948. Pp. 91. \$2.50.

Source Materials in Public Administration: A Selected Bibliography Reprinted from PAS Publication No. 102. ("Public Administration Service Publications," No. 102A.) Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1948. Pp. 30. \$1.00.

The text of *Public Administration Libraries* is a reprint of the 1941 edition of the same title. Because the fundamentals of public administration library organization and management presented in the earlier edition are as applicable to today's needs as they were foresighted in 1941, no change in the text was needed.

The reprinted matter in the volume under consideration includes a brief but clear picture of various types of libraries in the public administration field (e.g., municipal reference; state leagues of municipalities; county public administrations; legislative reference; state, regional, and federal agencies; citizens' organizations; research organizations; and those of public officials), with a description of the scope, use, and nature of the collections in each type of library. Also discussed are cataloging and classification processes, the furniture and supplies needed, preparation and care of materials for circulation (including clippings, pamphlets, periodicals,

maps, newspapers, pictures, and microfilm, as well as books), administrative functions of planning, organization, personnel, working conditions, budgets and finance, and public relations and reporting. Finally, there is a concise, yet comprehensive, chapter on how to make the library serve as a working laboratory of information rather than as a storeroom of facts.

Chapter ii, "Materials and Their Acquisition," contains the only strictly new material. All lists of references have been revised and greatly augmented, as is mentioned in the prefatory note, to reflect "the significant expansion of the literature of public administration." This is the section from which the lists in the second publication under review were printed.

These manuals are the work of a committee in the Social Science Group of the Special Libraries Association, whose chairman was Mrs. Lucile L. Keck, librarian of the Joint Reference Library in Chicago. Two others of the original committee, Mrs. Ione E. Dority, librarian of the Bureau of Government at the University of Michigan, and Mrs. Rebecca R. Rankin, librarian of the Municipal Reference Library of New York City, are responsible with Mrs. Keck for the careful revision of the list of publications in the 1948 edition.

Although *Public Administration Libraries* was written with the needs of the public administration librarians (especially those inexperienced in library techniques) in mind, its practical suggestions are adaptable to any special library. It could also serve as a refresher text for many an experienced librarian.

Charles S. Ascher said in his foreword to the first edition: "Perhaps the librarian-authors really have the last word: reading the manual may persuade the organization executive that he should have a full-time, trained librarian if his collection is to be a really useful tool for research."

ROSE L. VORMELKER

*Business Information Bureau
Cleveland Public Library*

"Maps, Their Care, Repair and Preservation in Libraries." By CLARA EGLI LEGEAR. Washington: Library of Congress, Reference Department, Maps Division, 1949. Pp. ix+46. \$0.30. (Lithoprinted.) Copies are available from the Card Division, Library of Congress.

Maps have not yet attained in our libraries the status that they merit in view of their unique contribution to study and research, on one hand, and their value as reference material to the general public, on the other. Various factors are responsible for this unfortunate situation, among them the difficulties in housing a map collection, the special problems involved in the care and preservation of maps, and the lack of assurance among librarians as to the most satisfactory techniques and methods of procedure.

Mrs. LeGear is ably prepared to formulate a manual on maps, having at her command years of experience at the Library of Congress, familiarity with all the important map collections in Washington and New York, and acquaintance with various map collections in other parts of the country. She has observed many practices in operation, some tried and tested by time and found to be good, others local improvisations. The manual is not offered as a catechism on techniques and procedures but rather as a "preliminary draft" presenting the scope and nature of map problems and summarizing procedures currently in use in various libraries. Diversity in practice and equipment is noted, and the librarian is invited to become acquainted with alternative solutions prior to making decisions most appropriate to his individual needs.

The manual covers procedures in processing; treatment of various types of maps, globes, relief models, atlases, and rare material; mounting methods and equipment, including repairing and cleaning; map filing equipment, with illustrations of types of folders and boxes and a list of companies making map cases; and, finally, comments regarding plans for the map room. About one-third of the manual is devoted to mounting, a fact which should convince one that the matter should be taken seriously or else be left to other, more expert, hands. A detailed table of contents forms a convenient index, and an extensive annotated bibliography will be of great help to anyone who wishes to pursue further any aspect of the problems.

There is much information, well-tempered advice, and refreshing evidence of good sense about map problems in this manual which librarians would do well to heed. In general, the manual will be of value to all librarians handling maps, regardless of the size of the collections involved, and to all administrators who want the problems of maintenance of maps in libraries

organized and clarified for immediate survey and study. The rock that may sink the boat, or at least give it a rough voyage, is that of finance. The library should, therefore, study its financial structure, remembering that upkeep is as important as initial outlay. Mrs. LeGear has outlined the scope and nature of the structure as calling for financial support beyond the cost of the maps themselves. With this manual in hand a library can recheck its current procedures or can more readily formulate a program for the development of a map collection. The way may be costly, but the results are worth the effort of careful planning, and libraries should not forget that, as Mrs. LeGear has pointed out, "if properly handled, maps are easy to use."

AGNES WHITMARSH

Map Library
University of Chicago

Japanese Prints: Bunchō to Utamarō: In the Collection of Louis V. Ledoux. Catalog by the owner, with twenty plates in full color and thirty-nine in halftone. New York: E. Weyhe, 1949. Pp. 120. \$25.00.

This is the third volume of the catalog which Mr. Ledoux made of his private collection. The two preceding volumes dealt with the so-called "Primitives" and with Harunobu and Shunshō, respectively. The present volume describes nine prints by Bunchō (1725-94), four by Shigemasa (1738-1820), four by Koryūsai (active from ca. 1765 to 1781), two by Shunchō (1743-1812), four by Kiyonaga (1752-1814), six by Shunman (1757-1820), and twenty-four woodcuts by Utamarō (1754-1806).

The author's pattern makes his catalog ideal: a short biography and appreciation of each artist is followed by the reproduction of all the prints with which he is represented in the Ledoux collection. These reproductions are in large size, and each is faced by a description of the subject matter, including the name of the person depicted, and, in the case of an actor, the specific role, title of the play, and date and place of the performance. The state of preservation is noted, and so is the color scheme. Signatures, seals, publishers' marks, and inscriptions are given in transliteration and translation.

There is only one print (No. 45) where the

persons represented might have been, but were not, identified. It is a very famous woodcut by Utamarō, showing the half-length portraits of three girls. They are Takashima O-Hisa, Tomitomo Toyohina, and Nanigawa O-Kita, reputedly the most beautiful girls in Edo around 1795.

As said before, this is a model catalog; but what will make it a treasure in every library are the twenty color plates. They are the best reproductions of Japanese woodcuts this reviewer has ever seen. Since the quality of the original is outstanding in every case, a good many persons will be sorely tempted to commit an act of biblioclasm.

LUDWIG BACHHOFFER

University of Chicago

Index-Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon General's Office. Issued by the U.S. Army Medical Library. ("Fourth Series," Vol. X.) Washington: Government Printing Office, 1948. Pp. 138+994. \$4.25.

Once termed the "greatest contribution to medicine" that America has made, the *Index-Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon General's Office* is now in its fifty-seventh volume, having listed 2,865,201 subject entries and 492,554 author entries to date. The current volume, the tenth of the "Fourth Series," covers the alphabet block M-MEZ, listing 5,890 books and pamphlets and 62,876 journal articles under 7,214 author entries and 6,943 subject entries in that block. The style of this mammoth medico-bibliography has not been changed from previous volumes issued.

Superseding the last list (issued in 1937 as Part 2 of the "Synopsis of Style" of the "Fourth Series," Vol. II) is a 138-page supplement of a "List of Abbreviations for Serial Publications Used in the Fourth Series of the Index-Catalogue," giving abbreviations adopted by the *Index-Catalogue*, short title, and place of publication. It is to be hoped that the 1,500,000 cards now comprising the "manuscript" *Index-Catalogue* soon too will see publication.

GERTRUDE MINSK

Bio-medical Libraries
University of Chicago

BOOKS RECEIVED

- The Administration of the College Library.* By GUY R. LYLE, with the collaboration of PAUL H. BIXLER, MARJORIE J. HOOD, and ARNOLD H. TROTIER. 2d rev. ed. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1949. Pp. xvi+608. \$5.00.
- Annotated List of Books for Supplementary Reading (Kindergarten-Grade 9), 1949-50.* Edited by DOROTHY KAY CADWALLADER. New York: Children's Reading Service (106 Beekman Street), 1949. Pp. 96. (Free copies may be obtained by any school-teacher, librarian, or principal upon request from the Children's Reading Service, 106 Beekman Street, New York 7, N.Y.)
- Audio-Visual Materials of Instruction.* ("Forty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education," Part I.) Edited by NELSON B. HENRY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949. Pp. x+320. \$2.75.
- Audio-Visual School Library Service: A Handbook for Librarians.* By MARGARET I. RUFVOLD. Chicago: American Library Association, 1949. Pp. vii+116. \$2.75.
- Bibliography and Footnotes: A Style Manual for College and University Students.* By PEYTON HURT. Revised and enlarged by MARY L. HURT RICHMOND. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949. Pp. xii+167. \$1.50.
- The Book Industry.* A Report of the Public Library Inquiry by WILLIAM MILLER. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. xiv+156. \$2.75.
- Books on Persecution, Terror and Resistance in Nazi Germany.* ("Catalogue Series," No. 1.) London: Wiener Library (19 Manchester Square), 1949. Pp. 51. 25. 6d.
- The Boston Public Library Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 1 (July, 1949). Published quarterly by the Trustees of the Public Library of the City of Boston (Copley Square, Boston 17, Mass.) Pp. 88. Annual subscription, \$2.00; single copies, \$0.50.
- Catálogo de la Exposición Bibliográfica Balmesiana organizada con motivo del I Centenario de la muerte de Jaime Balmes (1848-1948).* Edited by MARÍA DOLORES CARRÉ and MERCEDES FARRÉ. Barcelona: Biblioteca Central, 1948. Pp. 136.
- Catálogo de la Exposición Bibliográfica Hispano-Italiana de los siglos XVI a XVIII.* By JUAN GIVANEL Y MAS. Barcelona: Biblioteca Central, 1942. Pp. 64.
- "Catalogue of Union Periodicals," Vol. I: "Science and Technology Supplement." Edited by PERCY FREER. Pretoria: South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, 1949. Pp. xvi+522. (Lithoprinted.)
- Children's Voluntary Reading as an Expression of Individuality.* By MARY HAYDEN BOWEN WOLLNER. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949. Pp. 117. \$2.35.
- Classroom Techniques in Improving Reading: Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Reading Held at the University of Chicago, 1949.* Vol. XI. Compiled and edited by WILLIAM S. GRAY. ("Supplementary Educational Monographs Published in Conjunction with the School Review and the Elementary School Journal," No. 69.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, October, 1949. Pp. viii+246. \$2.75.
- Clinical Studies in Reading. I.* By the STAFF OF THE READING CLINICS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. ("Supplementary Educational Monographs," No. 68.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, June, 1949. Pp. 173. \$3.50.
- Communications Research, 1948-1949.* Edited by PAUL F. LAZARSFELD and FRANK N. STANTON. New York: Harper & Bros., 1949. Pp. xviii+332. \$4.50.
- A Descriptive Guide to the Libraries of the University of Leeds: Supplement.* By RICHARD OFFOR. Leeds: Brotherton Library, 1949. Pp. 39. 1s.
- Education in Arab Countries of the Near East.* By RODERIC D. MATTHEWS and MATTA AKRAWI. Washington: American Council on Education, 1949. Pp. xxiv+585. \$6.00.
- Education for Leisure.* By S. R. RANGANATHAN, with a Foreword by RANJIT M. CHETSINGH. Delhi: Indian Adult Education Association, 1948. Pp. ix+127.
- "Employee Personnel Practices in Colleges and Universities." A Survey Completed under the Sponsorship of the COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION. Spring, 1949. (Mimeographed.)
- "The European Press Today." Prepared by the EUROPEAN AFFAIRS DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS. Washington: Library of Congress, August, 1949. Pp. 152. \$1.00. (Lithoprinted.)
- Experiments on Mass Communication.* By CARL I. HOVLAND, ARTHUR A. LUMSDAINE, and FRED D. SHEFFIELD. ("Studies in Social Psychology in World War II," Vol. III.) Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949. Pp. x+345. \$5.00.
- "Extension Service for Adults." ("Organization, Administration, and Management of the Los Angeles Public Library," Vol. IV.) Los Angeles: Bureau of Budget and Efficiency, October, 1949. Pp. III. (Lithoprinted.)

- "Extension Service Requirements." ("Organization, Administration, and Management of the Los Angeles Public Library," Vol. VI.) Los Angeles: Bureau of Budget and Efficiency, July, 1949. Pp. 157. (Lithoprinted.)
- "Extension Service for Youth." ("Organization, Administration, and Management of the Los Angeles Public Library," Vol. V.) Los Angeles: Bureau of Budget and Efficiency, September, 1949. Pp. 94. (Lithoprinted.)
- "Facts and Figures about the Federal Government, Its Departments and Agencies and Their Activities." Compiled from the Reports of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission) by W. BROOKE GRAVES. ("Public Affairs Bulletin," No. 74.) Washington: Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, September, 1949. Pp. vi+71. \$0.45. (Lithoprinted.)
- "Federal Documents for Small Libraries." By LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON. ("Occasional Contributions," No. 7.) Lexington: University of Kentucky Libraries, Margaret I. King Library, 1949. Pp. 9. (Mimeographed.)
- Fifteenth Century Printed Books at the University of Illinois.* Compiled by C. U. FAYE. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949. Pp. 160. \$3.00.
- "Freedom of Information: A Selective Report on Recent Writing." Issued by the REFERENCE DEPARTMENT, EUROPEAN AFFAIRS DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS. Washington: Library of Congress, October, 1949. Pp. 153. \$1.50. (Planographed.) (Copies may be obtained from the Card Division, Library of Congress, Washington 25, D.C.)
- Führer durch die Hamburger Bibliotheken.* By the STAATS- UND UNIVERSITÄTS-BIBLIOTHEK HAMBURG. Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, Joachim Heitmann & Co., 1949. Pp. 99.
- German Book Publishing and Allied Subjects: A Report.* By the VISITING COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN BOOK PUBLISHERS. New York, December 10, 1948. Pp. 171.
- Gula de bibliotecas argentinas especializadas, Vol. I: Capital federal y provincia de Buenos Aires.* By FRÉDÉRIC FINÓ and J. LEONOR RUIZ. Buenos Aires: Escuela de Bibliotecología, 718, Uruguay, 1949. Pp. 76.
- I Did Not Interview the Dead.* By DAVID P. BODER. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949. Pp. xix+220. \$3.50.
- The Indian Press Year Book for 1949.* Edited by K. P. VISWANATHA AYYAR, V. K. NARASIMHAN, and POTHEEN PHILIP. Madras: Indian Press Publications, 1949. Pp. 314. Rs. 10.
- "Industries List: A Classified List of Industries and Occupations with a Numerical Notation." 4th ed. Cambridge: Baker Library, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1949. Pp. 18. \$1.00. (Planographed.)
- Librarianship: Essays on Applied Bibliography.* By RAYMOND IRWIN. London: Grafton & Co., 1949. Pp. 131. 8s. 6d.
- "Libraries of the Southeast: A Report of the Southeastern States Cooperative Library Survey, 1946-1947." Edited by LOUIS R. WILSON and MARION A. MILCZEWSKI, with a Foreword by HELEN M. HARRIS. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1949. Pp. xxiv+301. Cloth, \$3.00; paper, \$2.50. (Lithoprinted.)
- The Library and Audio-Visual Materials: A Bibliography.* By KURTZ MYERS. Detroit, Mich.: Audio-Visual Materials Consultation Bureau, College of Education, Wayne University, 1949. Pp. 24. \$0.50.
- "List of Documents concerning the Negotiation of Ratified Indian Treaties, 1801-1869." Compiled by JOHN H. MARTIN. ("National Archives Publication," No. 49-21.) Washington: National Archives, 1949. Pp. 175. (Planographed.)
- Manual of Book Classification and Display for Public Libraries.* By ERNEST A. SAVAGE. ("Library Association Series," Vol. VIII.) London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. and the Library Association, 1949. Pp. 240. 12s 6d.
- Motion Pictures, January-June, 1949.* Issued by the COPYRIGHT OFFICE, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS. ("Catalog of Copyright Entries," 3d. ser., Vol. III, Parts 12-13, No. 1.) Washington: Copyright Office, Library of Congress, 1949. Pp. vi+61. Published semiannually at \$1.00 per year or \$0.50 per copy.
- "Music Materials and the Public Library: A Report to the Director of the Public Library Inquiry." By OTTO LUENING. New York: Social Science Research Council, June, 1949. Pp. 87. (Lithoprinted.)
- La Música española desde la edad media hasta nuestros días: Catálogo de la exposición histórica celebrada en conmemoración del primer centenario del nacimiento del maestro Felipe Pedrell.* By HIGINIO ANGLÉS. Barcelona: Biblioteca Central, 1941. Pp. 82.
- Niederdeutsche Mitteilungen Jahrg. 5, 1949.* By the NIEDERDEUTSCHE ARBEITSGEMEINSCHAFT. Lund, Sweden: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1949. Pp. 210. Kr. 8.
- One Hundred Books about Bookmaking: A Guide to the Study and a Appreciation of Printing.* By HELLMUT LEHMANN-HAUPT. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. [81]. \$1.75.
- Palestine and Zionism: A Three Year Cumulation, January 1946-December 1948: An Author and Subject Index to Books, Pamphlets and Periodicals.* Edited by SOPHIE A. UDIN. New York: Zionist Archives and Library of Palestine Foundation Fund, 1949. Pp. xii+469.
- "Preliminary Inventory of the Land-Entry Papers of the General Land Office." Compiled by HARRY P. YOSHEPE and PHILIP P. BROWER. ("Preliminary Inventory," No. 22.) Washington: National Archives, 1949. Pp. iii+77. (Planographed.)

- "Preliminary Inventory of the Records of the Board of Investigation and Research: Transportation." Compiled by LEO PASCAL. ("Preliminary Inventory," No. 19.) Washington: National Archives, 1949. Pp. iii+12. (Planographed.)
- "Preliminary Inventory of the Records of the United States Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality." Compiled by FRED G. HALLEY. ("Preliminary Inventory," No. 21.) Washington: National Archives, 1949. Pp. iii+182. (Planographed.)
- "The Printed Works of Isidore of Seville." By ROBERT BENAWAY BROWN. ("Occasional Contributions," No. 5.) Lexington: University of Kentucky Libraries, Margaret I. King Library, 1949. Pp. 32. (Mimeographed.)
- The Public Library in the Political Process.* A Report of the Public Library Inquiry by OLIVER GARCEAU. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. xxvii+254. \$3.75.
- Reading in the Elementary School.* ("Forty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education," Part II.) Edited by NELSON B. HENRY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949. Pp. 343+lvi. \$2.75.
- "Religatum de pelle humana." By LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON. ("Occasional Contributions," No. 6.) Lexington: University of Kentucky Libraries, Margaret I. King Library, 1949. Pp. 33. (Mimeographed.)
- Repertorio de crónicas anteriores a 1810 sobre los países del antiguo Virreinato del Río de la Plata insertas en publicaciones periódicas y cuerpos documentales.* By J. LOUIS TRENTI ROCAMORA. Buenos Aires: Instituto Bibliotecológico, Universidad de Buenos Aires, 1948. Pp. 126.
- "A Report on American University Presses." By CHESTER KERR. Association of American University Presses, 1949. Pp. 302. (Lithoprinted.) (A limited supply of copies of this report for free distribution is available from the American Council of Learned Societies, 1219 Sixteenth St., Washington, D.C.)
- Report of a Survey of the Libraries of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, November 1948—March 1949.* By LOUIS R. WILSON and ROBERT W. ORR. Auburn: Alabama Polytechnic Institute, 1949. Pp. 215.
- Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress (Adopted by the American Library Association).* Issued by the DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS. Washington: Library of Congress, 1949. Pp. 141. \$1.50. (Copies may be obtained from The Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D.C.)
- "The Sadleir-Black Gothic Collection." By ROBERT K. BLACK. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, University of Virginia Library, 1949. Pp. 15. (Lithoprinted.)
- "Selective Checklist of Prints and Photographs Recently Cataloged and Made Available for Reference: Lots 2280-2984." Prepared by the PRINTS AND PHOTOGRAPHS DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS. Washington: Library of Congress, 1949. Pp. 58. (Planographed.)
- "Serials Acquisitions: Additions and Corrections Made to the Union List of Serials, August 1, 1949." Compiled by the GIFT AND EXCHANGE SECTION, NEW YORK STATE LIBRARY. Albany, N.Y.: University of the State of New York, 1949. Pp. 58. (Mimeographed.) (Requests for copies may be addressed to Mrs. Ethel Lansing, Gift and Exchange Section, New York State Library, Albany 1, N.Y.)
- A Short History of Chinese Art.* By HUGO MUNSTERBERG. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. Pp. 227. \$5.00.
- The South American Handbook, 1949: South America, Central America, Mexico, Cuba.* New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1949. Pp. 766. \$1.50.
- Standards of Bibliographical Description.* By CURT F. BÜHLER, JAMES G. MCMAW, and LAWRENCE C. WROTH. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949. Pp. viii+120. \$2.50.
- Stories: A List of Stories To Tell and To Read Aloud.* Compiled by EULALIE STEINMETZ. New York: New York Public Library, 1949. Pp. 99. \$0.75.
- The Story of Maps.* By LLOYD A. BROWN. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1949. Pp. xix+397. \$7.50.
- The Subject Index to Periodicals, 1947.* Issued by the [British] LIBRARY ASSOCIATION; general editor, T. ROWLAND POWELL. London: Library Association, 1949. Pp. xi+311. £5. 5s. 0d.
- "Summary of Proceedings, Third Annual Conference of the American Theological Library Association, June 20-21, 1949." Pp. 59. (Mimeographed.) (Distributed by Robert F. Beach, Secretary, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.)
- "A Supplement to the Woodward & McManaway Check List of English Plays 1641-1700." By FREDSON BOWERS. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, University of Virginia Library, 1949. Pp. 22. \$1.00. (Mimeographed.)
- A Survey of the Libraries of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.* By MAURICE F. TAUBER and WILLIAM H. JESSE. Blacksburg, Va.: Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1949. Pp. 120.
- "The Third Princeton Conference: A Meeting of the Cooperative Committee on Library Building Plans Held at the Firestone Library, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, April 4, 1949." Pp. x+67. \$2.50. (Lithoprinted.) (For sale by S. A. McCarthy, Secretary, Cooperative Committee on Library Building Plans, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, N.Y.)
- "Titelbeskrywing en alfabetisering vir die alfabetiese outeurs- en titelkatalogus." By P. C. COETZEE. Pretoria: Departement Biblioteekkunde, Universiteit van Pretoria, 1949. Pp. iii+58. (Mimeographed.)
- The Use of Television by the Public Library.* By the

LIBRARY PUBLIC RELATIONS COUNCIL, AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION. Chicago: American Library Association, 1949. Pp. 35. \$1.00.

The Washington Book Mart: A Descriptive Guide to the Libraries, the Field Library Services, the Public Information Offices, and the Procurement Offices of the Federal Government, Located in Washington, D.C. Compiled and edited by HUBERTA A. PRINCE. New York: Oceana Publications, 1949. Pp. 260. \$10.00.

"Work Measurement in Public Libraries: A Report to the Director of the Public Library Inquiry."

By WATSON O'D. PIERCE. New York: Social Science Research Council (230 Park Ave.), June, 1949. Pp. v+238. (Planographed.)

Your Child's Speech and How To Improve It. By AMY BISHOP CHAPIN and RUTH LUNDIN. Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1949. Pp. 30. \$0.75.

FOUNDATIONS OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY

*A Social History of the Public
Library Movement in New England
from 1629 to 1855*

By **JESSE H. SHERA**

SOURCES used: the records of the libraries themselves, the acts and proceedings of legislative bodies respecting library formation, the writings, both public and private, of those actively engaged in library promotion, and contemporary newspaper accounts.

326 pages 6 × 9 \$5.00

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

The Journal of Higher Education ■

in 1950 is found on the shelves of almost a thousand college and university libraries. Why? Ask the patrons of these libraries.

Subscription \$4.00 yearly
Special rate to libraries

Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio

The University Library

A STUDY OF THE ORGANIZATION, ADMINISTRATION,
AND FUNCTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

By *Louis Round Wilson* and *Maurice F. Tauber*

The American university library has shared in the significant growth of the modern university since 1900. In this systematic study of the principles and methods which characterize university library organization, administration, and function, generalizations are formulated for the first time for this highly important part of the modern American university. They will be especially useful to aid university librarians in the effective performance of the tasks of assisting scholars in teaching and research. Others who will find it valuable are university administrators, now largely responsible for obtaining financial support of libraries, members of university faculties and learned societies who make extensive use of materials, as well as students preparing to cope with the problems of university library administration. \$6.00

The University of Chicago Studies in Library Science

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

FORGOTTEN RELIGIONS

A Symposium Edited by VERGILIUS FERM

MUCH of the material in this volume is new even to scholars, the results of the most recent investigations in ancient cultures and social anthropology. In his preface, the editor sums up the purpose of this new book as "An attempt to bring together expressions of the faiths of men who belong to civilizations far remote from that of our own."

Religions include: Sumeria; ancient Egypt, Syria and Babylonia; the Hittites; ancient Canaan; prehistoric Greece and the later Greek mysteries; Alexandrian empire; ancient Persia (Mithraism, Manichaeism, Mazdakism); old Norsemen; Tibet; Australian aborigines; South American Indians; Shamanism; the Eskimos; the Navajo Indians; the American Hopi Indians; primitive culture. Latest literature is listed.

Illustrated.

\$7.50

LETTERS TO MY SON

By DAGOBERT D. RUNES

HERE is a book that will be given an honored place in the thoughtful man's library by the side of the treasured moral and reflective literature that has become part of our heritage.

Some advance opinions: "Reveals the vast wealth of the author's reading and the volume has many enlightening touches of his own genius."—Rev. Charles S. Macfarland.

"Only a man of great learning and great spirit could have written them. The American reading public will be fortunate to have access to these writings."—Bryn J. Horde, President, New School for Social Research.

\$2.75

CHINESE ART

By HUGO MÜNSTERBERG

A CONCISE but comprehensive account of the history of Chinese art from prehistoric times to the Manchu Dynasty.

Illustrated.

\$5.00

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, Publishers

15 East 40th Street, Dept. 272

New York 16, N.Y.